DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 574 JC 910 261

AUTHOR	Doucette, Don, Ed.
TITLE	Leadership Abstracts, Volume 3, Numbers 1-20, 1990.
INSTITUTION	League for Innovation in the Community Coll., Laguna Hills, CA.; Texas Univ., Austin. Community Coll. Leadership Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	42p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *College Administration; College Faculty; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; Decision Making; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); *Leadership; *Leadership Responsibility; Program Descriptions; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

This series of abstracts from the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program is published approximately bimonthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. Addressing a variety of topics of interest to community college administrators, this complete set of 20 issues for 1990 includes: (1) "Beyond Affirmative Action: Leadership Diversity That Works" (J. R. Gilliland); (2) "Staffing for a New Century: An Opportunity for Institutional Renewal" (M. Jenrette); (3) "Building Communities: A Checklist for Evaluation and Discussion" (N. Armes; K. McClenney); (4) "Renewing a Mature Community College" (J. L. Hudgins); (5) "Leadership for Teaching and Learning" (K. P. Cross); (6) "Statewide Articulation Cannot Be Done Tongue in Cheek" (A. R. Southerland; And Others); (7) "Partnerships with K-12 School Districts" (A. D. Arnold); (8) "Strategies for Serving Underprepared Students" (R. C. Richardson, Jr.); (9) "The Tech Prep Program: A New Course of Study" (J. Grimsley); (10) "Insuring Excellence in Community College Teaching" (J. E. Roueche); (11) "Responding to International Needs: A Model That Is Working" (J. Conway; And Others); (12) "The President's Role in Student Tracking" (J. Palmer); (13) "Not Leaving Technology Decisions to the Techies and Gurus" (C. Cross); (14) "Strengthening the Transfer Function: From a Zero-Sum Game to a Win-Win Situation" (J. S. Eaton); (15) "Leading a College Economic Development Program" (S. G. Katsinas; V. A. Lacey); (16) "American Higher Education on the Grill" (D. Angel); (17) "America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages" (T. Gonzales); (18) "Implementing a Diversity Restructuring Program" (L. I. Rendon); (19) "Time to Teach a New World: Education and Technology in the 21st Century" (L. J. Fjeldstad); and (20) "When the Pupil Is Ready, the Teacher Appears" (J. N. Hankin). (MPH)

leadership abstracts

ED331574

VOLUME 3, NUMBERS 1-20, 1990

DON DOUCETTE, EDITOR

League for Innovation in the Community College
25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203
Laguna Hills, California 92653
(714) 855-0710

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Doucette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IC 910 261

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

BEYOND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: LEADERSHIP DIVERSITY THAT WORKS

J. Richard Gilliland

While the planet is consumed with the need for people who can organize, manage, and lead, most countries of the world utilize only a small fraction of their human potential. Only parts of northern Europe and North America have begun to recognize the rich reservoir of leadership potential represented by women and persons of color and are developing mechanisms to utilize their talents and capabilities. Given the reality of changing demographics in countries such as the United States and Canada, it is simply good public policy to take advantage of the full range and diversity of human resources resident in their citizens.

Similarly, community colleges need to make full use of the leadership talents and capabilities of women and persons of color. The majority of community college students are women, and they should logically play a significant, even majority, leadership role in these institutions. Increasing numbers of students are nonwhite; many are immigrants from all parts of the world. A key challenge facing community colleges in the 1990s is to develop leadership teams that represent the diversity of their students and community constituents.

The Benefits of Diversity

Having men, women, and people of color in educational leadership and management roles adds diversity to all types of organizations. In systems theory, diversity is a natural property that allows for creativity and the testing of new ideas. Diversity encourages experimentation, with the result being an even more diverse system. Profound diversity is characteristic of all natural ecosystems, including human ones.

The logic applies to the inclusion of culturally different people in the leadership team of a community college, including persons of color, people from different age groups, persons from other countries, people from diverse work experience backgrounds, and even people with differing personality types. Such diversity encourages new program development and institutional innovation, while also mitigating the all-too-human tendency to continue unexamined past practices well beyond the point of effectiveness. The more points of view and the more references of experience there are, the more options that appear in response to both problems and opportunities.

Beyond Affirmative Action

Despite some retreats in the past decade, most major private corporations and nearly all public institutions have committed themselves to affirmative action. Yet, even the most fair and committed to equal opportunity have generally failed to understand how to go beyond affirmative action to truly benefit their organizations. Qualified and capable women and minorities may be hired but infrequently move up, resulting in the loss of highly qualified employees despite huge investments in expensive programs to recruit them in the first place.

However, the very best organizations develop an expanded vision of affirmative action that includes an appreciation of real cultural diversity as a key strength characterizing their leadership teams. No matter how well meaning, organizations that limit their view of affirmative action to fulfilling some notion of fairness, or worse, to passing legal or regulatory muster, miss the opportunity to become better organizations.

Similarly, community college leaders that go beyond affirmative action and equal employment opportunity can realize the full benefits of student, staff, and leadership diversity. Their institutions become more adaptable, their curricula more responsive to student and community needs, their policies and procedures more attuned to real world concerns, and their leadership teams more flexible and innovative. This is easier said than done, for mainstream values extol the "melting pot," which calls for a fusion of values, customs, languages, and cultures, rather than an appreciation for the values and qualities that make them different.

The greatest progress may be occurring in the private sector, where progressive companies are diversifying their leadership to achieve a competitive edge. While this is good business in a market-driven economy; unfortunately, successes have been limited. Even Honeywell, generally considered a highly progressive company, has achieved only limited success. Barbara Jerich, director of workforce diversity, says, "Although we are addressing workforce diversity, I think we have a long, long way to go, and not only here at Honeywell. I don't see an organization that has met the mark yet. In many cases the organizations which have seen the most change have done so only after what I call galvanizing events. A class-action lawsuit or a takeover attempt will

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

cause a quicker culture change than just about anything. We're hoping that by offering education, exposure, awareness, and behavior modification techniques, we'll eventually see attitudes come around."

Planned Programs for Change

To realize the benefits of diversity, colleges need to embark upon a planned program of long-term change that pursues two key objectives concurrently: 1) to develop attitudes among all college constituents that acknowledge the value of diversity and 2) to attract and develop college leaders at all levels who represent women, minorities, and other types of diversity.

Valuing Diversity. The chief executive officer is the key to achieving full recognition for the value of diversity, for it is the CEO's responsibility to mold the climate and culture of the organization. Using all of the tools, influence, and discretion of the position, each must assure that a college's culture accommodates diversity.

The CEO must work to create a work environment in which no individual is either disadvantaged or advantaged because of race, sex, creed, or any other characteristic of birth or culture. This requires a careful examination of unintended obstacles embedded in college policies and procedures. It may also include assisting veteran employees—often white, male, middle managers—not only to accept the possible value of diversity in their subordinates but also to cope with the uncertain dynamics of pioneering change.

Equally important is the chief executive officer's role in articulating a vision of what the institution can achieve by taking full advantage of the diversity of its students, staff, and leaders. Using the bully pulpit and symbols of position, the CEO can heighten sensitivity to the issue and mobilize the energies of the college community to seek the benefits inherent in diversity.

Staff Development. Staff development activities can be designed to encourage an appreciation of diversity among both employees and students. Metropolitan Community College implemented an inservice program of presentations and workshops that employed a combination of external consultants and internal talent to gradually heighten awareness of the value of diversity. Other college events, including graduation ceremonies, international program activities, special community service programs, and selected continuing education programs, were used to underscore the importance of this value. Even the course schedule—which included courses related to cultural and ethnic diversity—and the college-sponsored Christmas card—which contained a message consistent with the theme of valuing diversity—were pressed into service of the objective.

Developing Leaders Who Represent Diversity

Concurrent with efforts to achieve recognition for the value of diversity, colleges need to develop systematic programs to both attract individuals who represent diversity to the college and to develop them from within.

Attracting Diversity. A college that can demonstrate a culture and climate that values diversity will offer an attractive career opportunity for women and minorities. Recruiting efforts need to be tailored to get the word out about that special characteristic of the college. Personnel practices need to be designed to assure that position openings are well publicized, both in the national press and in correspondence to key leaders and contacts throughout the vast national network of community colleges. All representatives of the college, the CEO principal among them, must consistently model the values of the college on the hustings.

Developing Leadership Diversity. Colleges, however, need to take the final responsibility to develop their own leaders from among those staff who represent groups least well represented on the college leadership team. The college can support staff in their efforts to participate in several excellent leadership development programs conducted by national associations. They can support graduate education for staff in entry and mid-level management positions. Senior-level administrators can be encouraged to assist in identifying and serving as mentors for talented staff members with leadership aspirations.

Metropolitan Community College launched an internal leadership development program in 1981 that has greatly assisted the college's efforts to diversify its leadership team. The program includes a three-month administrative internship for full-time faculty and staff to try their hand at leadership activities in the college while being paid at their regular pay rate. More than half have used this internship as a springboard to full-time, permanent, administrative appointments. In fact, the majority who have gone through the program are now employed at community colleges in educational leadership roles. Virtually all of the interns have been women who have helped diversify leadership not only at MCC but at several other community colleges nationwide.

Twenty years ago Isabel Briggs Myers said, "Good teamwork calls for recognition and use of certain valuable differences between the members of the team." Metropolitan Community College has established itself as a leading institution in diversifying its staff. However, it also understands that women, persons of color, and leadership diversity do not automatically make an organization better. In order for diversity to continue to work, it must continue to help these individuals to actualize their strengths.

J. Richard Gilliland is president of Metropolitan Community College in Omaha, Nebraska. He is a leading practitioner addressing this topic and will make a major presentation of these ideas at Leadership 2000, an international conference on leadership development sponsored by the League for Innovation in the Community College and The University of Texas at Austin, in San Francisco, July 8-11, 1990.

Volume 3, number 1
January 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

STAFFING FOR A NEW CENTURY: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

Mardee Jenrette

Before the turn of the century, 30 to 50 percent of all community college faculty are expected to retire. This prediction has been validated by researchers, appears repeatedly in the higher education press, and has begun to set the agenda for national conferences. Even so, few institutions have begun to address systematically its implications, and most have failed to recognize the immediacy and magnitude of the potential crisis.

Also not completely understood is that intensifying recruitment efforts is an insufficient response to impending faculty turnover. Even revamping selection processes to insure that prospective candidates "fit" with institutional values and missions does not go far enough. Colleges already find themselves in competition for a dwindling pool of qualified applicants, especially for minority faculty, and only those whose culture and climate are hospitable to the next generation of increasingly pluralistic faculty will succeed in attracting them.

Nonetheless, the challenge to staff for a new century can also be viewed as an opportunity. The challenge is not limited to the human resource department and its recruiters, but presents an opportunity around which to renew an entire institution. Massive staff turnover affects the core of every community college—its teaching/learning mission; the breadth of the impact requires a multifaceted, institutionwide response.

The Teaching/Learning Project

The Teaching/Learning Project, initiated in 1986, is Miami-Dade Community Colleges's attempt to manage the consequences of faculty turnover systematically, and to capitalize on the opportunity to take a hard look at current assumptions and practices. The project has three interrelated goals: 1) to improve the quality of teaching and learning at M-DCC, 2) to make teaching at M-DCC a professionally rewarding career, and 3) to make teaching and learning the focal point of college activities and decision-making processes. Now in the fourth year of the project, the college is making substantial progress toward the realization of these goals.

Mobilizing the Institution

The critical first step was to communicate clearly the start of a major, institutionwide undertaking. Careful thought was given to the manner of communication and to setting the correct tone in order to insure broad-based participation in the project. The president personally brought the message, holding sessions on each of the four campuses, directly addressing as many staff as possible. A written document was distributed to support the verbal presentation. Both methods were used to avoid misinterpretation of the written word or distortion of a word-of-mouth message by a delegated transmitter.

The presentations by the president accomplished three goals: 1) The same information was given to all staff; 2) Listeners were made to feel their participation would be important—after all, the president was taking his time to address them personally; and 3) A clear commitment to the project from the highest level of administration was communicated. The appointment of a full-time director also signaled commitment and recognition of the magnitude of the task that lay ahead.

From its inception, the project paid close attention to formal and informal communications; assuring that all staff had the opportunity to keep informed and to provide feedback were key goals of the project. Acknowledging staff diversity and varied preferences for ways of receiving information, several formal channels were established and exising ones used. The *Teaching/Learning Project Bulletin* was produced on an as-needed basis, as were topical video tapes. An annual summary report was prepared at the close of each academic year. The Teaching/Learning Project was a frequent agenda item for meetings of the collegewide President's Council, faculty senate, and board of trustees.

Addressing Key Issues

A collegewide steering committee was appointed to oversee the project. Consistent with the philosophy of the project and a promise made at its inception to involve all who would be directly affected, both faculty and administrators were selected to serve by a careful, systematic process. The result was a representative committee composed of individuals having the respect of their colleagues and committed to project goals. One of the steering committee's first acts was to affirm its belief that the project goals were attainable.

A daylong "Conversation on Teaching and Learning" marked the first official meeting of the Teaching/Learning Project Steering Committee. Because the outcomes of this discussion would help set the project agenda for its duration, participation was broadened beyond committee membership, and even beyond col-

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

lege personnel. The aim was to identify as many factors as possible that impinge on the teaching/learning relationship. Concerns as disparate as the role of part-time faculty and maintenance of classrooms emerged from the conversation, and task forces were appointed to focus on each of the eleven major issues identified. Their nuclei came from the steering committee, with additional appointments to round out the working groups.

The composition of the task forces served two purposes: first, to give assurance that those most affected by recommendations on a topic would be involved; and second, to expand direct participation, thus helping to foster ownership in outcomes. To date, over 100 faculty, staff, and administrators have served on one or more Teaching/Learning Project task forces.

Statements of Values and Faculty Excellence

Earliest efforts focused on developing a statement of institutional values related to teaching and learning and articulating a statement of faculty excellence. Nearly two years of work went into the writing of these documents because a commitment to follow a process that encourages widespread participation, that relies on consensus building, and that aims at broad-based ownership takes time. Research was also commissioned to inform the process: interviews were conducted, focus groups were held, and surveys were administered.

Values. A statement of shared values concerning teaching and learning was developed and accepted as the consensus of all participating staff. It serves to guide the college in developing its mission, goals, philosophy, and operational procedures. Individuals considering employment at Miami-Dade can make a better decision on whether or not they wish to apply. Also, the values statement helps to guide recruiter activity.

Faculty Excellence. A consensus statement of the qualities and characteristics of excellent faculty at Miami-Dade was also developed. It identifies four categories which distinguish excellent faculty: their own motivation and their ability to motivate others, their interpersonal skills, their knowledge base, and their skill at applying their knowledge. The statement (and those for administrators and support staff soon to follow) will help to shape the design of screening and assessment processes for new hires. It will guide evaluation of portfolios for tenure decisions and for progression through the academic ranks. The statement will also allow each faculty, staff, and administrator to evaluate his or her own performance and to shape professional development plans in line with institutional needs.

Task Force Recommendations

While these documents have formed the base, other task forces have put forward equally significant recommendations that will change the shape of the conduct of college business well into the new century:

- New faculty should have a preservice orientation and be assigned mentors.
- Graduate courses on effective teaching/learning should be developed collaboratively with the University of Miami and offered to faculty on Miami-Dade campuses at the college's expense. The curriculum should capture the expertise of veteran M-DCC faculty so that their skills are not lost as new s[illegible] are hired.
- Teaching/learning centers should be established on each campus to support professional development for all staff, since all are involved in the teaching/learning process.
- Administrative and support staff should be evaluated and recognized on the basis of their contributions to the teaching/learning process.
- Physical standards should be established for classrooms and personnel assigned to keep rooms up to standards.
- An endowed teaching chair program should be instituted to reward those who have attained the highest standards of faculty excellence.

Together, these recommendations establish and reinforce a climate that encourages a commitment to excellence in teaching, in support services, in management and leadership to enhance the success of the teaching/learning relationship. All are being implemented.

Implementing and Institutionalizing Outcomes

To create and sustain a climate that fosters commitment and to change institutional behavior, outcomes of the project have been institutionalized as official policies and procedures of the college. Each task force's recommendations were forwarded to the project steering committee, to the President's Council, and then to the board of trustees. At each step, opportunities for discussing, clarifying, and modifying the recommendations enhanced understanding of the changes being suggested, reinforced the scope of the endeavor, and built ownership. Most important, the recommendations were strengthened by the addition of responsibility and accountability components that would make their implementation possible by the very individuals who would be expected to make them a reality.

The prospect of massive staff turnover presents community colleges with a golden opportunity. Looking through the eyes of the potential newcomer provides a critical perspective in evaluating an institution's success at fulfilling its teaching/learning mission. The prospect makes the timing right to reevaluate practices, to make changes, to celebrate strengths, to pass on the skills and expertise of veterans to newcomers—and to turn a potential crisis into an opportunity for renewal.

Mardee Jenrette is the director of the Teaching/Learning Project at Miami-Dade Community College. She had served on the faculty at Miami-Dade for 14 years prior to assuming leadership for the project in 1986.

Volume 3, number 2
January 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

BUILDING COMMUNITIES: A CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

Nancy Armes and Kay McClenney

The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges challenged every community college to "build community." To do so, the commission urged each to demonstrate a concern for the whole, for integration and collaboration, for openness and integrity, for inclusiveness and self-renewal. Further, the commission argued that these concerns should be evident in the values the institution holds; the goals it aspires to achieve; and the policies, procedures, and programs it implements to realize those aspirations.

Since the publication of the commission's report, *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century*, community colleges everywhere have focused on its recommendations for professional development programs, self-studies, strategic planning processes, and attempts to measure their institutional effectiveness. The following checklist is offered as a tool to assist community colleges to assess their institutional practices and characteristics with respect to the contribution or impediment each makes to the community-building process—which is at the heart of the principal recommendations of the commission.

Concern for the Whole

1. ____ There are institutional processes focused on the creation, sharing, and alignment of visions for the college community.
2. ____ A comprehensive process for evaluation of institutional performance is in place.
3. ____ Institutional evaluation includes consideration of the following:
   - ____ the relationship of the institution to its community
   - ____ the relationship among courses, programs, and functions
   - ____ the relationship among people across the institution
   - ____ the effectiveness of the core curriculum
   - ____ the effectiveness of across-the-curriculum initiatives
4. ____ There is clear evidence of coordination, collaboration, and integration between academic affairs and student services.
5. ____ Campus-life initiatives provide opportunities for students to develop on a number of dimensions, including intellectual, affective, social, physical, and aesthetic.
6. ____ Personnel policies, employment benefits, employee assistance programs, and development opportunities reflect an appreciation and respect for the "whole person."

Concern for Integration and Collaboration

7. ____ There are ongoing, institutionalized programs which demonstrate a commitment to integration and collaboration, such as:
   - ____ interdisciplinary courses and programs
   - ____ team teaching
   - ____ cooperative learning ventures.
8. ____ General education and technical/career education are effectively integrated, rather than treated as essentially separate or competing "tracks."
9. ____ There are ongoing, institutionalized processes for working collaboratively with the following:
   - ____ elementary and secondary schools
   - ____ four-year colleges and universities
   - ____ community-based organizations
   - ____ business and industry
   - ____ governmental entities

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

10. ____ Institutional policies, procedures, and funding arrangements support the forming of partnerships and collaborations, rather than encumbering them.
11. ____ Major institutional processes are effectively integrated (e.g., assessment results are used in planning; plans form the basis for allocation of resources; performance evaluation is linked to professional development; etc.).
12. ____ Collaborative learning opportunities are regularly provided students in the classroom, and relationships among students frequently suggest cooperative rather than competitive activity.

Concern for Openness and Integrity

13. ____ There are multiple pathways for organizational communication and decision making, ranging from the formal to the informal, across leadership strata and including all employees.
14. ____ The institution has both formal and informal processes for soliciting and using input from constituents in its external communities.
15. ____ Evaluation of programs, personnel, and students is an honest, vital, and useful process.
16. ____ Institutional ceremonies, traditions, and celebrations reflect stated values and goals.
17. ____ Shared values and visions, reflective of community building themes, are evident across institutional functions, levels, units, and locations.
18. ____ The institution and its members keep their word—to students, to community, and to one another.
19. ____ Institutional priorities are clear and directly tied to resource allocation.
20. ____ Institutional rewards and recognition programs purposefully reinforce community-building behavior.

Concern for Inclusiveness and Self-Renewal

21. ____ Programs are in place which are specifically designed to free the institution from barriers based on age, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, handicap, and role.
22. ____ The institution deals directly and honestly with evidence of inappropriate, discriminatory, or exclusionary behavior.
23. ____ Formal orientation programs, individual mentoring, and ceremony promote the integration of new employees and students into campus life.
24. ____ There are both formal programs and a variety of informal opportunities for professional growth and development among faculty, staff, and administrators.
25. ____ Both part-time faculty and part-time students are given the support necessary for them to feel included and perform successfully in the institution.
26. ____ Leadership roles and opportunities have been defined for faculty, staff, students, and mid-level administrators, and a process for identifying and developing potential leaders is in place.
27. ____ Classroom practices consistently include strategies to remove barriers and increase understanding across age, sex, race, religion, national origin, and other delineations.

This instrument can be used in a variety of ways: as a guide for group discussions or more formally as a survey instrument providing the opportunity for written evaluative comments. As an assessment tool, it is designed to make cursory, narrow, or incomplete review of an institution's environment for community building less likely. Viewed as criteria for success, the checklist represents a vision of what is possible for a mature and effective community college to achieve in the performance of its important missions.

Nancy Armes was executive director of the AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges and is consultant to the chancellor of the Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas.

Kay McClenney is policy and programs director, Education Commission of the States. She is a former member of the AACJC Board of Directors and served as research associate for the futures commission.

Volume 3, number 3
February 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

RENEWING A MATURE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

James L. Hudgins

The founding of Joliet Junior College at the turn of this century is often cited as the beginning of the community college movement. However, as the nation's 1,224 two-year community, technical, and junior colleges enter the last decade of that century, the fact is that the majority are less than thirty years old. Most experienced the excitement of birth in the 1960s, the headiness of growth in the 1970s, and the trials and difficulties of adolescence and young adulthood in the 1980s.

John Gardner was the first of many to describe four stages in the life cycle of an organization: 1) birth, 2) growth, 3) maturity, and 4) renewal or decline. Most community colleges have experienced the first of these three stages and enter the 1990s as fully mature organizations faced with the prospect of either renewal or decline. Of course, none would consciously choose decline, so a fundamental concern of community college leaders is how to insure institutional renewal that best prepares the college to meet the challenges of not only the 1990s, but also the next century.

A Case Study of Planned Change

Midlands Technical College is a comprehensive, multi-campus, community college located in Columbia, South Carolina, serving over 6,000 students with 450 faculty and staff in a district with a population of about 450,000. Like many community colleges, Midlands experienced an exciting birth in the 1960s and phenomenal growth in the 1970s. Also like many, it faced challenges in the 1980s, including those of declining enrollment and an aging faculty. When the college began showing signs of maturing, its leadership, forced to confront the options of renewal or decline, seized the opportunity to introduce a program of planned change.

The organizational renewal process consisted of three phases: 1) envisioning the future, 2) developing a plan, and 3) implementing the plan and evaluating its results. While it is not possible to detail each step of a multiyear effort involving hundreds of individuals, key elements of the college's experience dealing with its own maturation may provide useful insights to other colleges grappling with similar circumstances and issues.

Envisioning the Future

The first stage of the renewal process was to determine what key college constituents envisioned as the desired state of the college. All faculty and staff were surveyed and asked three basic questions: 1) What are the three most important issues or problems facing the college? 2) What are the three most important opportunities available to the college? and 3) What three plans of action would you initiate if you were the college president? Using the Delphi technique, the top ten responses to each question were distilled, reported to all staff, and used to develop action plans to improve the college.

There was considerable consensus that the most significant problems facing the college were declining enrollment, poor image and morale, and related problems. Not surprisingly, all agreed that the greatest opportunity was to develop a comprehensive marketing program to increase enrollment and enhance the image of the college in the community. The president held listening sessions with all academic and administrative departments. From these sessions and survey results emerged a consensus on the desired future of the college. The vision projected a college that: 1) has a clear sense of purpose, 2) understands its community, 3) emphasizes student success, 4) values human resources, 5) seeks collaborative relationships, and 6) is self-examined.

Developing the Plan

The vision development stage progressed into a more formalized strategic planning effort, which happened to coincide with the college's approaching ten-year reaffirmation of accreditation. As a first step, the college initiated a combined strategic planning process and self-study in 1986. The strategic planning committee doubled as the institutional effectiveness committee of the self-study. Thirteen other committees assisted the first stage of the planning process: assessing the present strengths and weaknesses of the college.

The self-study committees struggled to balance complicated issues of the college's strengths and weaknessses; for instance, a strength of the college was its effectiveness serving the business community with customized training programs, but a perceived weakness was its image as a narrow vocational institute rather than a comprehensive community college. The recommendations for improving the college made by the self-study committees satisfied the accrediting team, which had few additional suggestions.

The college then progressed through the remaining steps of the planning process: 1) developing assumptions about the future, 2) clarifying mission, 3) developing value statements, 4) creating long-range objectives to move the college toward vision attainment, 5) designing an annual operational plan with specific objectives, and 6) establishing criteria for success. The planning process itself assisted renewal efforts. It enabled diverse groups

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

to communicate about problems and issues they had never previously been able to discuss.

Planning resulted in two products; *Vision for Excellence*, a professionally designed executive summary presenting a vision of the college in the year 2001 to the community, and a loose-leaf, strategic plan detailing specific objectives for attaining that vision.

Communicating the Vision. *Vision for Excellence* became an important element in communicating the aspirations that the college had for itself to its surrounding community. The Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce and the college held a joint press conference to announce the issuance of the document and to emphasize the college's importance to economic and community development. The executive summary of the strategic plan was also disseminated to the press and received both newspaper and media coverage. Faculty and staff sought opportunities to communicate key concepts to civic and business groups, and the college initiated a planned visitation program to business and industry. The college's foundation sponsored a series of breakfasts to introduce community leaders to plans for the future of the college. Finally, a series of media advertisements designed around *Vision for Excellence* were aired to enhance the community's awareness of the college and its role in the community's future.

Operationalizing the Concepts. Perhaps of greater significance, however, were efforts within the college to help all faculty and staff to both understand and own a consensus vision of the college. Executive and faculty leaders worked to communicate the vision by relating daily events to long-range goals. Some divisions even developed "mini-visions" for their faculties and staffs. The strategic plan was established as the document regularly used to set priorities and allocate resources.

What began as a strategic planning process in 1986 developed into a comprehensive institutional effectiveness program by 1988. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools requires colleges to demonstrate their effectiveness in accomplishing their missions, especially their impact on student learning. Thus, the accreditation self-study reinforced the importance of planning and evaluation as ongoing college processes.

Implementing the Plan and Evaluating Its Results

The college then implemented a series of action plans. For example, in response to declining enrollment and poor image in the community, one was to create a marketing division, reporting to the president, comprised of all "first contact" services. A critical step, however, was that each plan was implemented with built-in procedures and criteria for evaluating its successful accomplishment. The success of the marketing plan was to be evaluated by, among other things, enrollment growth. The result was a comprehensive institutional effectiveness program that responds to public and accreditation demands for accountability.

Success Factors and Indicators. Since the quantity of evaluation data that could potentially be used to evaluate effectiveness far exceeded the college's capacity to collect and analyze it , six critical success factors were identified as essential to evaluating mission accomplishment: 1) accessible and comprehensive programs of high quality, 2) satisfaction and retention of students, 3) posteducation satisfaction and success, 4) economic development and community involvement, 5) sound and effective resource management, and 6) dynamic organizational involvement and development.

A set of indicators was developed for each success factor, as well as formats and procedures for using data to evaluate each. For instance, student satisfaction and retention was to be evaluated by such indicators as completion rates, user surveys, enrollment analyses, and measures of the use of services.

Institutionalized Evaluation Processes. As a result of this planning, the college developed and institutionalized routine processes for evaluating not only its overall effectiveness, but also the effectiveness of discrete programs and services in assisting the college to reach its planned future. Each year, the results of these program reviews are reported to the board of trustees, and an executive summary disseminated to the community.

Perhaps the most effective means of operationalizing the vision statement articulated by the college is that all college resources are allocated based upon their contribution to the attainment of the long-range vision of the college. When existing programs prove to be ineffective moving toward that desired future, they become immediate candidates for revision. On the positive side, however, the college has also developed mechanisms to celebrate people and programs that assist the college move towards its goals.

Now going into its fifth year, the program of planned change implemented by Midlands Technical College appears to be paying off. A follow-up survey found that faculty morale had increased remarkably since the initial assessment in 1986 and now exceed 80 percent positive ratings. Other external signs have validated the college's apparent success, including annual enrollment growth exceeding 10 percent; full funding from the local college district for the first time in the history of the college; a successful self-study and a maximum-length accreditation renewal with only minor suggestions for improvements, selection by the state commission on higher education and the regional accreditation commission as a model institutional effectiveness program; increased national exposure and recognition for faculty and staff; and increased numbers of cooperative projects and partnership relationships with various external groups.

By confronting head on the options facing a maturing community college, Midlands Technical College has succeeded both in developing a positive vision for its future and in implementing plans to achieve its goals. As a result, the college is now enjoying the fruits of renewal in its maturity.

James L. Hudgins has been president of Midlands Technical College since 1986. He has been active in developing institutional effectiveness criteria for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and has served as chair of its Commission on Colleges. This abstract summarizes a program presented at the first annual "Leadership 2000" conference.

Volume 3, number 4
February 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

LEADERSHIP FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

K. Patricia Cross

The leadership required for the year 2000 will be quite different from the leadership that built most community colleges in the 1960s. Determining where these colleges will be headed and what kind of leaders will be needed was a challenge to the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. The report of the commission, *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century*, has been widely read and has helped to set an agenda for community colleges nationwide.

The report really has two major themes. It calls first for building communities and second for strengthening community colleges as educational institutions. The commissioners merged the two themes neatly when they wrote, "Building community through dedicated teaching is the vision and inspiration of this report." (p. 8)

Building Community

The theme, building communities, reasserts the comprehensive mission of community colleges. Periodically, but especially in the late 1970s, scholars and practitioners alike debated the wisdom of the comprehensive mission on the grounds that it spread resources too thin and that community colleges should not try to be all things to all people. The commission, however, never seriously questioned the comprehensive mission; instead, it chose to meet the problem of declining resources by expanding the pie. It recommended partnerships to expand and strengthen key functions—between transfer programs and four-year institutions, between career preparation programs and employers, between community service programs andcommunity agencies, and between remedial and development programs and high schools.

The underlying premise of the report is that community colleges can be both comprehensive and excellent. However, the route to that goal lies in sharing resources rather than competing for them. This is an important insight in a time when lifelong education for all citizens emerges as a shared responsibility for all educational agencies in a community. Traditional institutions cannot do it all, especially if they are in constant competition with one another for funds, students, and prestige.

Community colleges have a long tradition of forming collaborative relationships, and have fortunately generally avoided competition with other educational providers. Unfortunately, community colleges have sometimes displaced their competitive instincts to internal relationships—between faculty and administrators for power and authority and among proponents of various programs for resources. Thus, the commission's focus on building community is especially pertinent for community colleges challenged by educational tasks that require collaborative efforts.

Many of the recommendations of the report concern efforts to build institutional climates based upon trust, open communication, and respect; these are undeniably key to building community. However, it is important not to confuse means with ends. The purpose of a college is not to develop high morale among faculty and staff, for example, but to provide quality education for students.

Strengthening Educational Institutions

The commission clearly identified teaching and learning as the shared vision that can energize community colleges, and this is the second major theme of its report. For the past quarter of a century, community colleges have been largely concerned with issues of expansion and contraction in higher education. Those times were ripe for managers and entrepreneurial leaders. The future, however, requires colleges united by a larger vision and a common task that pulls people together; such times require educational leaders.

The report of the commission specifies the challenge: "The community college should be the nation's premier teaching institution. Quality instruction should be the hallmark of the movement." (p. 25) The near missionary zeal that energized community colleges in the 1960s came from a shared vision of providing access and educational opportunity for neglected populations. While the commission is clear in stating that this goal must be relentlessly pursued, it also calls for a new energizing purpose—to fulfill the promise of access by providing excellence in teaching and learning.

There is vitality in the notion that everyone associated with community colleges should dedicate themselves to the cause of improving student learning. However, the energy to pursue dedicated teaching must come largely from the faculty. Efforts to improve access were led by administrators who raised money, built buildings, lobbied state legislatures, and made opportunities available. Now, the goal of marshalling the energies of the teaching faculty requires inspired leader-

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

ship, beyond competent administration.

Recent surveys of community college leaders confirm that most see educational leadership as the emerging role for community college presidents. Successful leaders will not be able to slight managerial responsibilities or concerns of effective governance, but times call for leadership that goes beyond building a strong organization to utilizing that organization effectively in accomplishing its educational mission.

The Classroom Researcher

The commissioners recommended a process of continuous self-renewal and professional development for faculty and urged colleges to define the role of the faculty member as that of a classroom researcher. This requires explanation of the concept of teacher as classroom researcher.

Classroom research is fundamentally different from educational research. Its purpose is not to discover universal laws of learning, but rather for faculty to answer very specific questions about what students learn in their classrooms as a result of their instruction. The skills required to answer these questions are not primarily technical but call for systematic and sensitive observation of students in the process of learning.

A basic assumption underlying classroom research is that accurate and credible feedback about the impact of teaching on learning carries a built-in challenge to teachers to see if they can increase learning through experimentation with more effective teaching methods. Classroom researchers, then, are primarily interested in gaining insights that will strengthen their base of professional knowledge about teaching. They seek to learn what works, as well as why it works—all in order to become more effective in their role as teachers and facilitators of student learning.

Classroom research is more related to faculty development than to educational research. Yet, there is a difference. The specific goal of faculty development is to improve faculty performance by providing information about teaching skills, by increasing self-confidence, and by creating a supportive institutional climate that recognizes good teaching. Classroom research, on the other hand, focuses on student learning. The premise is that as teachers become aware of the impact of their teaching on their students' learning, they will make appropriate modifications to help students learn.

Effective Rewards

How might community college presidents best lead their faculty to make their colleges premier teaching institutions? Generally, administrators have only indirect influence on what goes on in the classroom. Even the reward systems which they control are not uniformly effective in motivating faculty.

Reward systems are basically of three types: 1) extrinsic, such as salary, promotion, and tenure; 2) satisfactions that are by-products of the activity, such as recognition programs; and 3) intrinsic rewards. Extrinsic incentives have proven limitations in motivating faculty to excellent performance. In fact, attempts to tie compensation to ill-defined standards of teaching effectiveness often act as disincentives. Recognition programs can have some positive effects, but tend to reward past performance rather than motivate new efforts.

This leaves intrinsic rewards for faculty, an area generally unexplored by community college leaders. Intrinsic rewards are those found in the satisfaction of seeing students learn or the intellectual stimulation found in preparing an intriguing lesson. Research into the characteristics of college faculty show them to be achievement oriented, intellectually curious, and autonomous. A logical assumption is that they want to be good teachers, that they enjoy the challenge of teaching for maximum impact, and that they are self-motivating and self-renewing once challenged.

This suggests that effective educational leaders need to capitalize on faculty predilections for problem solving and high achievement and find ways to encourage them to experiment to improve their students' learning. Developing mechanisms to support and encourage classroom research is one way to increase the intrinsic rewards for excellence in teaching. Intrinsic rewards are not likely to replace extrinsic rewards in policy making, but ways to increase them need to be found.

To sum up, the Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges has a dual theme, which, upon reflection, merges into a single theme—building communities in order to improve the quality of education for community college students. The message is unifying rather than divisive: the mission of community colleges is education. Excellence in teaching should occur wherever teachers meet students, be it in remedial, adult, transfer, career, or general education classes, or in student development programs and support services.

If community colleges leaders are to become the "foremost advocates of teaching and learning," they are going to have to know something about education and how colleges perform that age-old ritual efficiently and effectively. They are going to have to know how to lead their faculties toward establishing community colleges as the nation's premier teaching institutions. This is not an easy task, and preparing community college leaders for that future is as much a challenge to those of us in the universities as to those of you in community colleges.

K. Patricia Cross is Conner Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. This abstract summarizes her keynote address to the first annual "Leadership 2000," given June 13, 1989. The second annual conference will be held in San Francisco, July 8-11, 1990.

Volume 3, number 5
March 1990

Don Doucette, editor

12

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

STATEWIDE ARTICULATION CANNOT BE DONE TONGUE IN CHEEK

Arthur R. Southerland, Rex Leonard, George D. Edwards, and James R. Hutto

The smooth transition of students from high school to college is a long-standing goal of both secondary and postsecondary levels of education. However, by virtue of their position in the overall educational system, community colleges have a complicated task. They must deal with articulation in at least three directions—downward to the high school, upward to four-year colleges and universities, and outward to business and industry.

Nowhere does the current poor record on the orderly movement of students among educational levels demand more concerted action than in state systems of public education. In a taxpayer's mind, the distinctions among levels and types of education blur into one system with a common purpose: to educate students. When evidence surfaces that secondary schools, community colleges, and universities do not cooperate to allow easy transition among levels, taxpayers justifiably conclude that one or more of the institutions are ineffective and inefficient in the use of public funds. The clear and increasingly present danger is that such perceptions lower public support for all levels of education.

Barriers to Effective Articulation

Barriers to effective articulation are numerous, and many have been chronicled by both scholarly research and state audits and investigations. However, at the root of the problem is that state educational systems are fragmented. Each level has its separate governance structure, often only loosely coordinated. These structures have promoted isolationism among their respective institutions and school officials. Each operates independently in developing its budget and in formulating often differing missions and educational philosophies. Worse, such isolation often results in keen competition among levels and institutions for available state dollars.

Isolation, of course, breeds a mutual lack of trust which severely restricts the kind of cooperation necessary to insure that students benefit from well-articulated programs and policies. Four-year colleges and universities have long resisted accepting courses offered by community colleges as equivalent to their own. Even when carefully negotiated institutional agreements guarantee course equivalence, departmental faculty at the senior institutions sometimes reject transfer courses and accept them only as electives rather than as satisfying department requirements. Community colleges can also be guilty of arrogance and mistrust and are sometimes reluctant to accept credits for work completed at the secondary level. Students caught in the middle find that their secondary school vocational-technical programs overlap with community college certificate and degree programs in occupational fields. Of course, baccalaureate institutions will generally not accept credits earned in occupational programs, even in the most advanced technologies, should the student attempt to further his or her education beyond the associate degree.

Even when a lack of trust does not intrude, school officials tend to wait for others to take the initiative for articulation. The heavy workloads of faculty and administrators at all levels distract attention from substantive efforts at cooperative planning.

Changing Attitudes

It is possible to recite a litany of inefficiencies in the system and examples of students caught up in failed or extended attempts to negotiate movement from one level to another, and efforts to address specific, highlighted problems have improved articulation in many states. However, substantive, systemwide change requires more than a patchwork of stopgap measures. Long-term improvement requires recognition by faculty, counselors, administrators, and key officials at all levels that not only students, but also they, stand to benefit from a well-articulated educational system.

This requires basic attitudinal change, as well as skilled and committed leadership to bring it about. The following recommendations represent a beginning agenda to effect necessary change:

1. ***Establish a mind-set for articulation.*** In his 1970 report on articulation, Fred Kintzer observed that a prerequisite to improvement is the recognition that articulation is an attitude that must be personified by all members of the faculties, administrations, and boards of secondary schools, community colleges, and universities. All levels should initiate formal processes that result in unequivocal official policies that endorse articulation among all public educational institutions as a fundamental commitment to students.

2. ***Transfigure the conception of articulation from passive to active.*** Armed with commitment, the senior

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

institutions should take the initiative to reach out to other levels to bring about necessary changes. College, university, and public school boards in the same service area should develop joint resolutions of commitment to seamless articulation and specific plans to seek out honestly and eradicate thoroughly all barriers to effective articulation.

3. ***Conduct regular meetings dealing with articulation among representatives from the various segments of the educational enterprise.*** The leaders of the various institutions should meet to establish their shared commitment, to develop mutual trust and respect, and to establish the agenda for improving articulation for their staffs. To indicate the high priority of articulation at all levels, a single, senior-level leader at each institution should be placed in charge of coordinating articulation activities. Faculty members and counselors should also be brought into the discussions at an early stage. Released time from regular duties may be necessary to provide in order for staff to undertake significant improvement activities. Specific objectives and time lines for their achievement need to be established by each task force.

4. ***Encourage a spirit of equality among public school, community college, and university professionals working together on articulation.*** In all interactions with high school personnel, individuals from colleges and universities should be careful to cultivate an atmosphere of collaboration rather than one of condescension. To facilitate the spirit, university personnel should go to the community college, and college staff should visit the high school, as often as possible, rather than expecting public school officials to come to their campuses.

5. ***Expand the focus of articulation to include attention to more than just the transfer of courses.*** Looking at the system from the student's point of view, articulation from high school to college is not only a change in educational programs but a significant transition in social climates, as well. Typically, high school students come from a very structured environment in which their academic and extracurricular activities are scheduled to occupy the full school day; attendance requirements are mandated by state law; and all students are peers and basically the same age. These circumstances suggest that articulation planning must be carried over into the orientation activities of the college. As a part of the process, high school students should be encouraged to become familiar with the college campus and community college students with the university through frequent visits and formal and informal activities. Articulation plans must also address issues related to differences in financial arrangements, not only for tuition, but also for books, supplies, and even bus transportation.

6. ***Make wider use of faculty exchanges.*** Hiring qualified high school faculty as adjunct instructors in community colleges and universities may serve as an additional linkage between types of institutions. Likewise, teaching selected college courses in the high school for advanced secondary students can complement each institution's quest for excellence.

A Model Attempt

An attempt to accomplish better articulation among its public educational institutions has recently been implemented in Mississippi. In an unprecedented degree of interaction, the three boards which oversee public education in the state have joined forces in Project '95, an ongoing series of activities aimed at fostering and strengthening collaboration. The Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL), the State Board of Community and Junior Colleges, and the Mississippi State Board of Education have endorsed the overriding goal of Project '95: "to better prepare all Mississippi high school students for the challenge of higher education and the modern work world."

Coordinated through the IHL board, the project relies strongly upon a thirty-five member advisory committee comprising approximately equal numbers of professionals from each level of education. The advisory group is divided into nine subcommittees, one of which deals explicitly with articulation, though each of the other eight subgroups also deal with issues relating to articulation as well. To date, actions growing out of the discussions include 1989 summer institutes for high school faculty in selected disciplines, revisions of selected high school curricula with assistance from the universities, and the development of statewide articulation agreements for community college transfers.

It is virtually impossible to argue against the benefits to students and the taxpaying public that result from a well-articulated system of statewide public education. However, as the title of this article suggests, solving the problem must go far beyond lip service, and even beyond isolated fixes to specific problems. States like Mississippi are attempting to address articulation issues collaboratively. Other states, such as Florida with its common course numbering system for public postsecondary education, have made important strides.

However, the key to ultimate success is a change in attitude that recognizes that the self-interests of all segments of the educational system are bound up in their common interest. Community college leaders have an important role to play in leading this fundamental change.

Arthur R. Southerland and Rex Leonard are professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Research, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi; George D. Edwards is chair, Division of Applied Science and Technology, Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia; and James R. Hutto is director, Project '95, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Education, Jackson, Mississippi.

Volume 3, number 6
April 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 455-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

PARTNERSHIPS WITH K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Allen D. Arnold

It has become increasingly certain to educators and the public alike that the nation must redesign its educational system if it is to meet the pressing social and economic demands of the 21st century. Certainly, the system needs to retool to meet the workforce requirements of an increasingly technological, competitive, and interdependent world.

Interestingly enough, the collaboration that is necessary among the nations of the world on the macro-level is precisely what is required among educational institutions on the micro-level. As Hodgkinson has argued, the various levels and types of educational institutions from kindergarten through university graduate schools comprise "all one system." Community colleges play a pivotal role in linking K-12 systems to postsecondary education. In particular, they can help unite the entire system by partnership efforts with their local high schools. No institutions are better positioned to bridge the levels in the system than community colleges; no group more key to this endeavor than community college leaders.

Early Partnership Efforts

The leadership of Triton College began some time ago to develop partnerships with its local high schools. In December 1983, more than 75 local educators and school board members met with key college administrators to discuss the results of the current national reports on education and the perceived need for cooperation among their institutions. A two-day conference, entitled "Partnership for Excellence," resulted in the establishment in the spring of 1984 of the School/College Partnership consisting of Triton College and the six high schools in its district. The stated goal of the partnership was to raise the educational level of the entire community.

Since that time, the partnership has developed and nurtured an unprecedented degree of trust among college and high school officials, helped along by such activities as joint in-service retreats for administrators that have recently been expanded to include middle school superintendents and administrators.

However, the substance of the partnership's success is programs that assist students to learn and to move easily from high school to college . Partnership efforts have included jointly operated extension centers in the high schools providing both credit and non-credit classes and jointly sponsored competitions, including Scholastic Art, TEAMS (Test of Engineering Aptitude, Mathematics and Science), and a Business Olympics. The most important initiatives, however, are those that provide an ongoing avenue for students to utilize and experience programs and services offered by Triton College while they are still in high school, thus facilitating the continuity of student learning.

Dropout Prevention and Intervention

The partnership, in cooperation with feeder elementary districts, is attempting with federal and state funds to attack the dropout problem of a metropolitan school system undergoing rapid demographic change. Programs serve both potential dropouts and out-of-school youths who have dropped out in the last five years.

Alternative, Evening, and Adult High School. Triton provides various opportunities for dropouts to complete high school coursework at the college. The Alternative High School enables students who are under 21 years of age but find it difficult to enroll in mainstream courses to earn the credits they need to graduate. The Evening High School also serves students under the age of 21 who need to make up deficiencies in order to graduate but who, for various reasons, most often work schedules, cannot attend regular classes during the day.

Another program, the Adult High School, is unique in that it allows a student over 21 to take courses that have been approved and articulated with the requirements of all six cooperating high school districts, thus permitting graduation with a diploma from the high school in the district in which he or she resides. To meet the needs of limited English-speaking students from the six high schools, a joint English as a second language program was also developed in which students attend intensive daylong classes held in one of the high schools.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Gifted and Talented

Partnership efforts have also resulted in a number of programs on the other end of the academic skills spectrum for gifted and talented students.

The Scholars Program. The Triton Scholars Program was designed by college administrators and local superintendents as a "college within a college." It is targeted for bright students who, although academically qualified, are unable to attend prestigious colleges or universities for a number of reasons, such as insufficient financial resources or family obligations. The high school superintendents have committed to assist in the selection process and to "drive the kids' parents to Triton, if necessary" so they can learn about the program.

Significant aspects of the Scholars Program include the development of courses modeled after those offered by nationally prestigious institutions in content, writing and reading requirements, and academic expectations. A Triton Scholar also works with a faculty member as a mentor for the full two years and, through this process, completes a portfolio of achievements prior to transfer. Triton trustee scholarships, which provide free tuition for all in-district students who graduate in the top 10 percent of their high school classes, assist these students to finance their participation in the Scholars Program.

Advanced Placement. Academically talented students who qualify in their respective high schools for advanced placement have the opportunity to take several courses for college credit in their senior years. This credit-in-escrow program allows students who can schedule time in their regular high school days beyond what is required by state funding regulations to take classes offered at their high schools from adjunct faculty hired by Triton College.

Regional Vocational Articulation

Triton and its local high school districts have also collaborated to provide coordinated programs to assist those students preparing to enter the work force by establishing the Regional Vocational Articulation program. This district-wide initiative provides students pursuing vocational-technical education with carefully articulated curricula that begin in the high schools and are completed at the postsecondary level. These are essentially two plus two, tech-prep programs that assure students who attend the college the benefit of their previous work at the secondary level.

The first of these programs with carefully articulated course objectives were offered at Triton in the fall of 1989 in the broad areas of business, industrial technology, and home economics.

Student Postsecondary Education Plan

The goal of this project of the partnership is to establish a routine process for high school counselors to help students plan their futures. It involves an important investment by both the high school and the college because it demonstrates that the high schools' commitment goes beyond graduation day and that the college has a responsibility to all young people in the district, whether or not they choose to attend Triton.

The program attempts to reach those many students who fall between the cracks after graduation by making planning for the thirteenth year as routine as for the previous twelve. Students are asked to plan for beginning a career, entering military service, or attending a selective university, but are also expected to plot out a fall-back position just in case the first choice does not come through. These back-up plans often include Triton College, and for students who start in jobs, there is also the option of taking a course or two while working. For many who go away to large universities, the back-up plan can be important should they reconsider their choice of college or be forced to return home for any reason. The postsecondary planning process allows them to fit easily into academic programs at Triton for as long as necessary to pursue their long-term educational goals. Students are also informed of other college services, such as career and job placement services, library and computer resources, and tutoring services, that are available to them as residents of the district.

These collaborative efforts are examples of the range of programs that can be developed by local school districts and community colleges working together with a shared commitment to students and their success. Community college leaders have a prominent role to play in establishing such mutually beneficial partnerships and in insuring that students and the nation are served by a coherent and united system of education.

Allen D. Arnold is executive vice president at Triton College, River Grove, Illinois, where he serves as chair of the Partnership Committee. Various partnership initiatives were presented at "Leadership 2000," June 1989, in San Francisco, and additional details about these programs are available from the author. He has also recently been selected to participate in the 1990 Executive Leadership Institute, conducted by the League for Innovation to assist senior-level administrators prepare for the community college presidency, to be held August 4-10, in Newport Beach, California.

April 1990
Volume 3, number 7

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

STRATEGIES FOR SERVING UNDERPREPARED STUDENTS

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

The current concern with underpreparation is the consequence of two decades of policy decisions that have left community colleges accountable for serving less well-prepared students who graduate and transfer at levels significantly below those previously attained by better-prepared cohorts. The issue of preparation cannot be separated from factors of race and ethnicity. African Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians disproportionately rely upon community colleges for initial access to higher education, and the data on their rates of participation and achievement suggest that community colleges are part of the "pipeline" problem, as well as a potential contributor to the solution.

Defining Underpreparation

The way a problem is defined has much to do with shaping the efforts aimed at its solution. The preparation problem has generally been defined in terms of student deficiencies. The deficiency approach has used assessment testing to identify underprepared students, though there are major limitations to this approach. A 1986 study of why students succeed, rather than why they fail, attempted to furnish an alternative to the prevailing deficiency model. Researchers interviewed 107 minority graduates from ten four-year colleges and universities, many of whom had previously attended a community college, and more than half of whom had begun their college careers labeled as underprepared.

Opportunity Orientation. The interviews showed that preparation includes accurate expectations about college participation, and the term "opportunity orientation" was coined to describe the beliefs that the students had about the part education plays in gaining access to valued adult roles. Students with opportunity orientations that exclude education as an appropriate activity are most likely to attend college as adults, if at all, and bring with them the liabilities of their previous educational experiences, as well as the challenges of balancing coursework with the demands of a family and a job.

Four Categories of Students. The study also identified four categories of student preparation:

I. Well-Prepared with High Opportunity Orientation. The first group included minority graduates from educated families who attended suburban or high performing inner-city schools and always expected to go to college. These students succeeded at selective institutions, despite sometimes being stereotyped as underprepared, and were very unlikely to attend community colleges.

II. Marginally Underprepared with High Opportunity Orientation. A second large group involved first-generation college students who lacked the preparation of the first group, but who had grown up with strong parental encouragement to build a rewarding life by attending college. This group identified mentoring, summer programs, and such support activities as tutoring and learning laboratories as critical to their ability to persist. A significant proportion of this group began their postsecondary careers in a community college.

III. Marginally Underprepared (or Worse) with Low Opportunity Orientation. A third, quite small group grew up in families and communities where the people with whom they associated had not been to college and where they were consistently advised that attending college would make no difference in the opportunities they would subsequently experience. Hampered by a lack of preparation and a low opportunity orientation, graduates from this group overcame incredible odds to earn degrees, including negative peer and family pressures.

IV. Well-Prepared with Low Opportunity Orientation. A fourth, very small group was well-prepared, but lacked the conviction that college would make a significant difference in their lives. This group was made up primarily of American Indians who came from reservations where unemployment rates were high and opportunities for professionally trained workers very limited.

Institutional Responses. The characteristics of these four groups help define the preparation issue for community colleges. Group I students, whether minority or majority, are heavily recruited by selective institutions because they can be served successfully by existing programs and services. Group II students are also heavily recruited. Even though they require special assistance, they attend in the traditional full-time mode and are highly motivated. While institutions must make some changes to serve them effectively, often such changes can be accomplished by specialized staff, leaving the academic core of the institution free to continue traditional learning practices. Group IV is to some extent an anomaly created by the unique circumstances of life on an Indian reservation, but could include well-off majority students who have not been persuaded that the quality of their lives depends upon their own exertions.

Group III is disproportionately African American and Hispanic and concentrated in urban areas. No institutions are anxious to serve this group by taking seriously the responsibility for helping them achieve success across the entire range of academic majors. Inner-city community colleges are willing to have them as clients as long as the outcomes defined for judging institutional success are social welfare-oriented or preparation for lower-level vocational careers. The problem for community colleges is the task of achieving traditional outcomes for these students whose diversity in preparation and opportunity orientation make them poor candidates for traditional learning practices.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

A Model for Institutional Strategies

Institutions develop strategies to deal with issues of student preparation that involve three key variables: student characteristics, expected outcomes, and organizational culture. These constitute a model for colleges' strategies to serve underprepared students more effectively. However, strategies to change the expected outcomes or to lower the requirements to achieve desired outcomes are not viable options for community colleges. Degree achievement and transfer remain the outcomes upon which the public policy to establish community colleges as opportunity institutions is founded.

Removing Barriers. Public policy to increase diversity and participation in higher education does not provide community colleges the option to screen out underprepared students. In fact, their record on removing barriers through recruitment, financial aid, flexible scheduling, and other programs is quite good. Institutions can fine tune these strategies to attract better prepared students as well; however, additional emphasis on removing barriers has at least as much potential for increasing the preparation problem as for moderating it.

Changing Students. More promising are strategies that focus on preparation that reduces the mismatch between institutional expectations and student capabilities. Community colleges can motivate high school students to stay in school and to take more rigorous coursework through outreach programs. They can strengthen preparation and assist transition through summer programs. They can emphasize mentoring and tutoring to offset limited opportunity orientations in addition to providing extra help for students with nontraditional academic preparation.

Such strategies can be found in abundance in most community colleges. Some improvement in outcomes may result from further refinement, better coordination, and making programs and services more widely available. It seems highly unlikely, however, that community colleges can solve the underpreparation problem by relying exclusively on these interventions. Rather, they will have to modify their learning environments to broaden the range of diversity they effectively serve.

Changing Organizational Culture. College leaders can manage organizational culture to provide a more supportive learning environment for underprepared students by developing and implementing strategic plans, focusing on the assessment of selected outcomes, selecting new staff that embody desired values and behaviors, and providing incentives to existing staff to encourage them to support needed changes.

Key strategies include student assessment to create more manageable learning conditions in the classroom. Developmental education programs can be used both to provide direct support to students and to pressure faculty by demonstrating that underprepared students can achieve academically under the right conditions. The use of technology to alter classroom dynamics has still untapped potential. Promoting curricular and pedagogical change can also be used as a powerful strategy for changing culture, especially where faculty are central to institutional decision-making.

Arguably, community colleges have paid more attention to all of these strategies than their four-year counterparts. In fact, part of the transfer issue clearly relates to the unwillingness of four-year institutions to match the scheduling adjustments, support services and responsive learning environments routinely provided by many community colleges. Changing organizational culture is the most promising long-term approach for dealing with preparation issues, though short-term strategies remain necessary to address immediate problems while awaiting longer term culture change.

Deficiency and Achievement Models. Most institutions apply the deficiency model aimed at bringing everyone to some minimum level of academic preparation. However, a number of innovative programs have piloted an achievement model that focuses on helping some students achieve excellence. Inner-city schools have developed magnet school programs with striking results, and at least one medical school has developed a program that admits promising college juniors and assists them to prepare for the rigorous training while still undergraduates. Both programs remove barriers, help students adjust to high expectations, and change the learning environment they experience.

Unfortunately, community colleges are not free to choose between the deficiency and achievement models. Given scarce resources and continuing pressures from students seeking access, they must continue to implement the deficiency model as best they can. Concurrently, some may choose to dedicate more of their resources to programs where carefully selected and highly motivated nontraditional learners experience the opportunity to achieve excellence.

The preparation issue is arguably the most important challenge community colleges currently confront. It cannot be neutralized by redefining outcomes, nor avoided by excluding high risk students. Changing the learning environment, especially student interactions with faculty members, by employing an achievement model that builds upon students' strengths rather than focuses on their weaknesses is the only alternative promising long-term improvement.

The task of implementing achievement models in institutions historically committed to access is, above all, a task of managing culture. It is the only approach through which the faculty who control the nature of the learning environment and its impact on students can be influenced to alter their prevailing deficiency views and practices. There are emerging models of the way the process works. Efforts to manage culture will be aided by the opportunity to employ new staff as those representative of founding values and beliefs retire in large numbers over the next decade.

Richard C. Richardson, Jr. is professor of higher education and associate director, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Arizona State University. *This article is abstracted from a paper commissioned by the League for Innovation in the Community College and presented as part of a colloquium on underprepared students held at Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina, March 23-24. The paper will be published in its entirety by the League in the fall.*

Volume 3, number 8
May 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

THE TECH PREP PROGRAM: A NEW COURSE OF STUDY

Joe Grimsley

The 1980s began with great concern about the decline of the nation's educational system. The evidence included declining test scores, increasing high school dropout rates, demoralized teaching staffs, and decaying facilities. Educational reforms were implemented, and some important improvements were achieved. However, by the end of the same decade, the inability of the nation and its work force to compete effectively in the emerging global economy replaced declining educational standards as the great national lament. Of course, these concerns are more than casually related.

Estimates place the percentage of new jobs requiring some postsecondary education as high as 80 percent. Labor shortages are growing imminent in the 1990s, and the gap between the increasing skill levels required in the work force and the decreasing skills of new entrants into the work force is widening. At the same time, only about one quarter of all high school students enroll in a college preparatory course of study. The "neglected majority"—so named by Parnell in his 1985 book of the same title—unfocused, unguided, and uninspired by traditional secondary vocational programs, lose interest in school and take the least demanding courses that meet high school graduation requirements; many simply drop out.

Parnell recommended a program of articulated technical preparation as a partial solution to the dual problems of increasing high school dropout rates and declining global competitiveness. North Carolina has led in the broad-based implementation of this recommendation, and Richmond Community College, which began developing its successful "tech prep" program in 1986, now has considerable experience with the program and data to demonstrate its effectiveness in lowering high school dropout rates, strengthening the academic core of participating high schools, and increasing student performance and success, as well as modeling partnership efforts to serve students across levels of the educational system.

The Tech Prep Program

Tech Prep (technical preparation) is a course of study offered jointly by a high school and community college that is designed to meet the need for high school graduates to develop higher-level technical skills. It is a replica of a college prep course of study in many respects but designed as a carefully sequenced "four plus two" program leading to an Associate of Applied Science degree from a two-year college. The program is based upon a strong academic core and upgraded vocational courses, many of which integrate mathematics, principles of science, and computer applications.

At Richmond County Schools, tech prep programs are offered in three principal areas: business, engineering (industrial, mechanical, and electrical), and health and human services. In careful consultation with their parents and guidance counselors, students sign up for tech prep programs as eighth graders. They then pursue one of the curriculum areas, each of which requires core courses that include algebra I and II, geometry, precollege English, biology, physical science, government and economics, and United States history. Other courses are included in each student's schedule depending upon state graduation requirements and individual career goals.

It is important not to dismiss tech prep programs as vocational tracking designed to protect the academic core of high school and college curricula. In fact, one of the principal purposes of a tech prep program is to strengthen the academic preparation of those neglected majority of high school students who would otherwise not plan to pursue any postsecondary education. Not only are higher level mathematics and science courses required by tech prep programs, but courses in English and the social sciences are also mandated both for high school graduation and associate degree achievement. Finally, advanced technical courses, such as principles of technology, computerized drafting,

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

electronics, industrial technology, accounting, and entrepreneurship are included in the program.

Implementing the Program

The tech prep program at Richmond Community College is an outgrowth of years of cooperative planning efforts with the Richmond County Schools that began in 1984. The formal proposal to develop the cooperative program was approved by both boards in December of 1986 and implemented in September of 1987.

Registration for the tech prep programs begins in January of each year with the distribution of program brochures to eighth graders through their guidance counselors and to their parents by various means, including distribution by local employers in their employee's paychecks. Radio and newspaper advertisements encourage parents to sit down with their children and to consider tech prep as an option for a high school course of study.

In order to offer better career guidance, a computerized guidance center was created to help students focus on choices. Each student receives a hard copy of planning results to take home for parental review, and parents must cosign the registration selection. Registration materials are then completed and returned in the early spring.

The key to the program is that students are given concrete and obtainable goals upon entry into high school. However, they are not locked into narrow vocational programs because the courses that they are taking are actually at a higher level than they might otherwise be enrolled in, and the majority are also college preparatory courses. Students may enter the tech prep program after eighth grade, but they must meet the prerequisites for the courses offered in subsequent grades.

As a result of the carefully articulated program, Richmond Community College provides no technical instruction at the secondary level. The program insures that students entering the college are prepared for postsecondary technical curricula. While in high school, students are provided with detailed requirements of the full range of the college's career programs.

Demonstrated Success

In three full years of operation, enrollment in the Richmond County tech prep program has grown to 30 percent of all high school students. More importantly, a number of key indicators demonstrates the progress the program has made in achieving two key goals: to improve the academic preparation of high school students and to reduce the dropout rate.

Since the implementation of the program in 1987, the average SAT scores in the county have increased 47 points. The number of students declaring intentions to attend either two- or four-year colleges or universities has increased from 48 percent to 76 percent. The high school dropout rate has decreased from 7.2 percent to 4.8 percent.

Even more interesting is the result of a decision by the Tech Prep Steering Committee to offer algebra to students previously not challenged by the subject. The results demonstrated that a greater number of students could, in fact, handle higher-level math. In 1986, before implementation of the program, 352 students, or 47.1 percent of the freshman class, took algebra I and scored in the 53.6 percentile on the state end-of-course test. In 1989, 506 students, or 75.7 percent of all freshmen, took algebra I and scored in the 58.7 percentile statewide, and the failure rate did not increase.

While there are no numerical indicators to gauge whether the tech prep program is succeeding in reaching its goal of improving the preparation and competitiveness of the county's work force, the program has been adopted by counties throughout North Carolina and exported to other states. In 1988, the program was identified by the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center as having potential to influence the state's economic development, and funding was provided to employ an executive director for the Tech Prep Leadership Center of the Richmond County Schools and Richmond Community College.

Tech prep programs demonstrate the power that partnerships among educational institutions have for assisting in the solution of key social and economic problems. Issues of educational excellence and economic competitiveness are two sides of the same coin, and both are well-served by programs that are designed to meet student needs wherever they exist in an educational system integrated from kindergarten through college.

Joe Grimsley is president, Richmond Community College, Hamlet, North Carolina. For more information about the college's tech prep programs, contact Myrtle Stogner, executive director, Tech Prep Leadership Center, Richmond Community College, P. O. Box 1189, Hamlet, North Carolina 28345, (919) 582-7187.

Volume 3, number 9
May 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

INSURING EXCELLENCE IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHING

John E. Roueche

Community college leaders are collectively committed to insuring that excellence in teaching remains the hallmark of their institutions. More than one report has held out the goal that community colleges become and be recognized as the premier teaching institutions in all of higher education. Yet, the circumstances facing these colleges could not make this goal more challenging.

Half or more of all college and university faculty will retire or otherwise leave the profession in the next decade. At the same time, colleges of education have essentially stopped producing college teachers who have been prepared, socialized, and enculturated to be college instructors. To further compound the problem, college students in the next decade are going to be more heterogeneous and less well-prepared than at any time in the history of the nation, and this diversity will require exceptionally talented teachers. Nowhere is the gap between the preparation of recent master's degree recipients and the characteristics required of beginning instructors greater than in community colleges.

How well community colleges respond to these key challenges will determine their success in reaching the goal of teaching excellence. Academic leaders have the major responsibility for staffing their colleges with quality faculty possessing the skills, characteristics, and commitment that will be necessary to meet the needs of community college students in the next decade and beyond. Their responsibility consists of four important jobs.

Hire Quality Faculty

Job one is hiring well. It is hiring talented and committed professionals who truly want to make a difference in the lives of their students. Hiring well means hiring individuals who understand and are committed to the missions of community colleges and whose values are congruent with those of these institutions. Because community colleges tend to award tenure to most of the faculty they hire, who they hire has everything to do with the quality of the faculty. Colleges simply cannot afford to make too many hiring mistakes.

Identify What is Wanted. Perhaps the most important aspect of hiring well is the first step: carefully determining the characteristics and values desired in new community college faculty. Efforts to find and recruit the best possible faculty can only be successful if community colleges know what they are looking for—only then are they likely to look in the right places.

Community colleges, as much or more than other institutions of higher education, have a special responsibility to increase substantially the number of minorities in faculty and leadership positions—both to insure their ranks are proportionate to their student populations and because cultural diversity enhances the teaching and learning environment. Even more fundamentally, community colleges want exceptional teachers, individuals who are both masters of their disciplines and masters at motivating and inspiring students. Studies have identified the characteristics of such teachers, and these describe individuals who like students, take an interest in students, and are available to them in and out of the classroom.

Recruit Proactively. Finding this different breed of faculty requires proactive and targeted recruiting. It requires going beyond traditional credentials, certificates, and letters of reference to find people who know how to stand up on day one in a classroom and reach students effectively. It requires savvy and sophistication to find the best teachers available.

The pool of applicants should never be limited to those candidates who write and announce their intentions to apply for faculty jobs that have been advertised as available. Academic leaders who are serious about improving faculty quality should get on the telephone, call the colleges and universities with strong programs in the disciplines in which there are vacancies, and ask the department chairs to identify the best young recent graduates who are outstanding teachers. Community colleges who expect to replace retiring faculty with quality prospects need to actively seek recommendations and solicit applications from the best candidates known to them. It is critical to insure that applicant pools contain individuals with the characteristics of quality teachers before any serious search can proceed.

Implement Effective Screening. Once a pool contains a sufficient number of candidates, a search committee proceeds to review credentials, professional experience, and letters of reference. However, it is important to implement review processes that go beyond paper screening to discover the best teachers in the pool.

The first caution is to understand that letters of reference are not reliable indicators of quality. They are written almost exclusively by those who have agreed to write positive evaluations. Rather, a serious screening process should include telephone calls to their references to probe for more candid assessments of candidates' strengths and weaknesses, and then follow-up calls to others who know the candidate but who were not listed as references.

Another strategy is to conduct telephone interviews with all serious candidates for the position. The key to the efficacy of such interviews is to ask the right

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

questions. In the case of hiring teachers, the important questions should concern how the candidates would perform in classroom situations. Much can be learned by asking applicants for teaching positions how they would conduct the first hour of a course, what kind of work they require of their students, how they assess student performance, and what teaching practices they have found to be particularly effective.

Then, after selecting the finalists using telephone reference checks and telephone interviews to supplement paper screening, these candidates should be brought on campus for interviews, and colleges should pay their way. While colleges have often taken the view that candidates should indicate the seriousness of their applications for positions by being willing to invest in trips for interviews, this is a penny-wise and pound-foolish strategy. The 1990s will become an increasingly competitive sellers' market, and colleges serious about hiring the best possible faculty simply need to invest in the processes that will result in multi-million dollar hiring decisions. Further, some very good candidates may be excluded because they cannot afford to pay their own way—a risk that smart colleges should not take.

Finally, once candidates are on campus, they should be asked to teach a three-hour class as a demonstration of their abilities as classroom teachers. Half or more of all community college classes are three hours long, and only the best teachers can hold students' attention and stimulate learning over this length of time. It seems the best and fairest of all hiring criteria to ask candidates to compete on the basis of their performance of the job that they are being hired to do.

Orient and Develop Faculty

Job two for academic leaders in community colleges is to provide new faculty with the training and preparation they need to be the best possible teachers. Orientation programs for new faculty should be serious attempts to introduce them to college procedures, available support services and resources, characteristics of the student body, explicit and implicit expectations, and subtleties of the climate and culture of the organization. Programs can be modeled after the weeklong orientation for all new faculty members in the Province of Ontario, which includes instruction by master teachers in subjects ranging from legal requirements of college faculty to classroom evaluation and teaching techniques.

In addition to initial orientation programs, colleges should invest in ongoing professional development activities for new faculty, including specially designed graduate courses on the history and mission of community colleges and the latest developments in effective pedagogy for multicultural learning environments such as those required of all probationary faculty at Miami-Dade Community College. Faculty mentor programs are another vehicle to assist new faculty to succeed in meeting the initial challenges of their positions, as well as to rejuvenate veteran faculty, as both visit each others' classrooms, compare notes on evaluation and teaching strategies, and plan curricula.

All good community colleges have comprehensive professional development programs that concentrate on assisting teachers to do their jobs effectively. Such programs include seminars, workshops, presentations, and other activities that serve to reinforce the central message of the institution: teaching is important here and the college is willing to allocate time and resources to improve the quality of classroom instruction.

Evaluate and Reward Good Teaching

Job three for academic leaders is to evaluate faculty as part of an ongoing attempt at quality improvement. There are many ways to evaluate faculty, but the focus must be on classroom performance because the principal job of community college faculty is to teach.

Comprehensive evaluation programs involve student reviews, supervisor evaluations that include classroom observations, and peer review. Increasingly, community colleges are developing ways to assess student outcomes, and these may also be helpful in evaluating teacher effectiveness. While nearly all faculty evaluation systems and methodologies have their critics, my assessment is that the peer review system operated by The University of Texas at Austin for the past ten years has worked exceedingly well. It drives rational behavior, and there is extraordinary consensus, year after year, about meritorious performance.

Job four is to recognize and reward good teaching. Again, there are numerous ways to fashion extrinsic reward programs. The best faculty are motivated primarily by the intrinsic rewards associated with reaching their students and positively affecting their development and their lives, yet the same faculty appreciate and are reinforced for their efforts by the positive regard of their peers and supervisors. Rewards can range from tangible merit pay systems to recognition programs that identify "teachers of the year." Master teacher programs go beyond simple recognition to increase teaching effectiveness throughout the institution by engaging these teachers in activities to assist less experienced ones develop their skills.

The point of evaluation, recognition, and reward programs is to send the message that "good teaching is rewarded here." It is the core message of community colleges, the theme that most exemplifies the goals and aspirations that they have for themselves.

In summary, it is not possible to spend too much time or money hiring quality faculty. Once hired, it is not possible to spend too much orienting them and continuing to develop their skills as effective teachers. Finally, it is critical to evaluate faculty with care and then to recognize and reward them for their performance and accomplishments in the classroom. Community colleges are about good teaching. Teaching quality is too critical to their success to do less.

John E. Roueche is Sid W. Richardson Chair and program director, Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin. This essay is abstracted from a speech made to a conference on the role of the department chair sponsored by Kansas State University, February 8, 1990. He is also codirector of the W. K. Kellogg Leadership Project which sponsors the publication of Leadership Abstracts.

Volume 3, number 10
June 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

RESPONDING TO INTERNATIONAL NEEDS: A MODEL THAT IS WORKING

Jean Conway, Patsy Fulton, and Mike Khirallah

Many community colleges, as well as four-year colleges and universities, have long traditions of involvement in international education. However, both the nation's rapidly changing demographic face and the emergence of a global economy have placed a new urgency on providing international programs that respond to a range of student needs.

International programs are called upon to address the needs of the increasing number of foreign nationals studying in the United States, while at the same time, serving the different needs of recent immigrants who depend upon public community colleges for the language and job skills required for successful integration into American life. Such programs can also be the focus of college efforts to internationalize the curriculum and to assist their students to develop skills and perspectives that will allow them to participate competitively in the emerging world economic order.

Recognizing these needs, Brookhaven College, part of the Dallas County Community College District, embarked upon a five-year planning process that resulted in the establishment of its International Center in June of 1989. The college's experience can provide a model for other community colleges in developing programs to meet the diverse needs included under the international education umbrella.

The Model in Operation

Brookhaven's International Center has three major components: instructional, student services, and community outreach programs.

Instructional Programs. The objectives of the instructional programs include: 1) coordinating campus programs for teaching English to speakers of other languages; 2) providing cross-cultural training for students, faculty, and staff and assisting in college efforts to internationalize the curriculum; and 3) serving as a resource for study-abroad programs.

The English language instructional program began in 1984 with a six-level, continuing education program and a four-level, preacademic, credit program providing instruction in three major skill areas: listening and speaking, reading, and writing and grammar. Both programs have grown dramatically. Currently, the credit program is staffed by three full-time instructors and 25 part-time instructors, and the continuing education program employs 18 part-time instructors.

In 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act mandated an educational requirement for persons seeking legal residency status, and this spurred the expansion of the instructional program. To help undocumented workers in Dallas County fulfill requirements in English, U. S. history, and government, Brookhaven applied for and received Federal monies to begin an amnesty program to provide free courses for qualified persons. More than 3,000 students have been served in the program since its inception in fall 1988. One of the benefits of the program is that it has served as a bridge to other college programs. Approximately 45 percent of the program's completers have made the transition—25 percent to credit programs and an additional 20 percent to the continuing education English program.

Another component is the Intensive ESL program, providing instruction in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and grammar to foreign students holding student visas. Those in the advanced level of this program also contribute to instruction in other disciplines by participating in panel discussions and other activities to share their cultural perspectives. The participation of foreign students not only assists the development of their own English-language skills, but also contributes to efforts to internationalize the college curriculum and to develop global perspectives in native-born students.

Another major goal of the center is to raise the awareness of the college community about global concerns. The center sponsors multicultural workshops that focus on acknowledging and valuing the diversity of students and the unique contributions of various cultures, and these workshops have been instrumental in the development of international components in the college curriculum. For example, program faculty are designing a multicultural component for all courses in child development. Library resources have been added to supplement these new components. Also, selected technical manuals have been targeted for modification to make them accessible to students with limited English proficiency. Faculty and staff are encouraged to attend

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

national and international conferences to develop expertise in working with diverse populations.

Finally, the center has served as a resource for students, faculty, and staff seeking opportunities to study or teach abroad. Programs have been developed in which students can study in Germany and England. This fall an intensive Spanish program, transferable to four-year institutions, will be offered in Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Student Services. A second, major objective of the center is to assess and advise international students. Initial intake processes include assessment of language proficiency and other academic skills, using tools such as Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, Test of English Proficiency Levels, Spanish Literacy Test, and Oral Interview. Advisors use the results of these assessments to help students establish goals.

The provision of key student services has been identified as critical to student success, especially for at-risk students, many of whom are immigrants or other nonnative speakers of English. Testing procedures often require bilingual instructions, but even other services, such as admissions and financial aid counseling, also require special accommodations. In fact, the demand for cross-cultural career counseling has forced a reevaluation of both traditional counseling techniques and psychometric testing. Modified support services, such as specialized tutoring, tracking and retention, and social adjustment activities, have also been introduced.

Community Outreach. A third objective of the International Center is to reach out to initiate partnerships with the international business community by providing services, such as seminars, translation services, language classes, and access to resources. The center sponsors breakfast meetings to introduce these services to the business community. It also responds to organizations or businesses requesting an interpreter or translator; on-site, customized ESL classes; speakers; or referrals to international resources in the community.

In addition, the center sponsors special lecture series and cultural activities for the community. For example, the center cosponsored a world religions series in which invited scholars lectured on five major world religions. The culmination of the series was a festival in the International Courtyard—a celebration of the cultural, religious, and international diversity at the college.

Successful Program Implementation

The experience of Brookhaven College in establishing the International Center as a major initiative of the institution illustrates the high level of commitment required for a successful program. From the moment the center was proposed, it was clear that such an undertaking would change the college and require redirection of organizational energies and resources, renegotiation of new agreements, and the establishment of new strategies and processes. In order to get grass-roots support for the effort, a task force was appointed to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations. Two highly respected individuals were chosen to cochair the task force, and membership was broad-based and represented all categories of employees, including faculty, administrators, and professional support staff.

Even more critically, college leadership responded to the recommendations of the task force by providing the resources necessary to implement them. Both budgets and space were reallocated with some difficulty, but the clear commitment of the college community to the needs of the international student remained in focus throughout the process.

The reward for the collective effort has been a program that has already demonstrated a record of accomplishment. Over 5,000 students have been served since the International Center officially opened one year ago. Since 1984, when several of its programs were first initiated, students from over 90 countries have participated, and enrollments in English language courses have grown geometrically. The center is a source of pride for Brookhaven's international students, faculty, and staff, and it is identified by the external community as a showplace for international guests to visit, as a source for interpreters, and as a provider of intensive English courses for area universities.

To plan for the future of the International Center, an advisory committee composed of faculty and staff from all college divisions has been appointed and charged with advising center staff on new programs and needs. Proposed programs include a comprehensive, English-in-the-workplace initiative that would provide both on-site, work-related, ESL instruction and content-related instruction for vocational programs; a mentoring program for international students; a community referral plan; international units of study added to discipline areas; and linkages with various countries to provide greater exchange opportunities for students and faculty.

The challenge and opportunity is to continue to meet the need for international programming that is certain to emerge. The Brookhaven College International Center provides a stable, institutional context from which to respond to the surprises the future surely holds in the international arena.

Patsy Fulton has been president of Brookhaven College in Dallas, Texas, since 1984, and she was recently elected to the AACJC Board of Directors. Mike Khiralah is director of the International Center and Jean Conway is an ESL instructor; both were instrumental in setting up the ESL Program and the International Center.

Volume 3, number 11
July 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

THE PRESIDENT'S ROLE IN STUDENT TRACKING

Jim Palmer

Demands for information on student outcomes have spurred the development of student tracking systems—computerized data bases that provide longitudinal data on students' progress through college and on their subsequent success. However, most of the literature on student tracking addresses the technical issues of concern to data processing personnel, institutional researchers, and others who build these data bases.

Yet, this emphasis masks the important role to be played by policy makers, particularly by community college presidents. A technically sound system using state-of-the-art computers will have little value if it does not address key policy issues, or if no provision is made for using the data it generates to inform discussions of institutional effectiveness. College presidents have an important role to play in articulating the purposes of a student tracking system, insuring that necessary data are routinely collected, and determining how data generated by the system are reported and used.

Determining What the College Wants to Know

The contents of a tracking system (that is, the data to be included for each student) generally fall into three categories: 1) measures of the attributes students bring with them to the college, such as ethnicity, educational goals, or academic ability; 2) term-by-term measures of academic performance, such as grade point averages earned each semester or credits earned as a proportion of total credits attempted; and 3) measures of success after students leave college, such as performance at transfer institutions or in the workplace. Such data make possible longitudinal analyses of nearly endless combinations of student outcomes and attributes. The task faced by college leaders is to determine what it is the college wants to know about students and, hence, what data should be included in the tracking system.

Determining Appropriate Indicators. A central part of this leadership task is to specify indicators of student progress and outcomes that the college will use to assess its role in helping students advance through the educational pipeline, or otherwise to meet their educational goals. These indicators should be tied to the college's mission and should have clear operational definitions. For example, an indicator of student success in the college's developmental studies program might be defined as follows:

> *The percent of students who, within two years of completing the college's sequence in remedial reading and writing, successfully complete the college's freshman-level composition course with a grade of "C" or better.*

Another indicator might take the form of a transfer rate, using a definition such as that proposed by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges:

> *The percent of first-time students (those with no prior college experience) who, within five years of enrolling in a community college, complete at least twelve credits there, and subsequently enroll in at least one course at a four-year college or university.*

These indicators determine the content of a tracking system's data base. Those cited above, for example, require data on the courses students take each term, the grades and credits earned in those courses, the previous educational experiences of entering students, and records of transfers enrolled at four-year institutions.

Insuring Data Collection. Any number of indicators can be defined, so long as the college can sustain the requisite data collection and processing effort. If the college wants to analyze course completion rates by ethnicity, gender, handicapped status, or receipt of financial aid, appropriate data elements will have to be included in each student record. If it is desirable to compare the graduation rates of students majoring in different program areas, then each student record needs to include a field for program major. The more the college wants to know about its students, the larger the student tracking data base. The college president can help balance the desire for multiple measures of student outcomes with the practical need to limit the data base and data collection procedures to manageable levels.

Tracking Students After They Leave The College

Much of the data needed to build a tracking system is available through routine student records. Most colleges have at least some data on attributes, such as student demographics, scores on tests of basic skills, or student educational objectives. In addition, measures of term-by-term academic progress are readily available in the form of course grades. Tracking systems may fall

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

short, however, in following the academic and career experiences of students once they have left the college. Unless more is done to gather information on transfer rates, job placement rates, and other indicators of the success of former students, tracking systems will do little more than gauge persistence and attendance patterns at the community college itself.

College leaders, then, can make a significant contribution to the tracking process by marshalling the resources and the will needed to gather information on former students. In some cases, this task is made easier by state mandates requiring four-year institutions to provide feeder community colleges with information on the academic progress and degree achievement of their former students. However, in the absence of state assistance, community colleges need to take the initiative to insure that their neighboring four-year institutions provide comprehensive and timely data on transfer students. In many cases, presidents must lead the development of cooperative relationships with their four-year counterparts upon which follow-up studies depend.

Presidents can also be instrumental in obtaining follow-up information on former students who have entered the work force by using their contacts with local business and industry. They can add their names and the influence of their positions to surveys of former students, as well as their support for adequate resources to conduct effective follow-up surveys. Presidents can do much to insure that tracking systems include key information beyond the completion of courses at the community college itself.

Using the Data Appropriately and Effectively

Data collection itself rarely leads to interesting insights or useful information to assist the assessment and improvement of college efforts. Effective processes for interpreting and reporting the data are required in order for student tracking systems to make a difference.

Reporting Guidelines. College leaders have an important role to play in providing clear expectations for the nature and use of reports of student outcome data. The following guidelines can be applied to the generation of reports that detail indicators of student flow and achievement in simple, nonpunitive formats:

- Keep each report brief (no more than two pages) and focused on one indicator or one group of related indicators.
- Provide operational definitions for all indicators.
- Avoid rank-order comparisons that might be misinterpreted as quality judgments. For example, if transfer rates are reported by program of study, care should be taken to explain that programs with higher rates are not necessarily better at preparing students for transfer than those with lower rates. Several factors, including students' educational objectives, may explain important differences.
- Stress that indicators are not absolute measures and are, therefore, not the final word on student outcomes. For example, declining transfer rates may or may not indicate a problem in the effectiveness of college's ability to prepare students for upper-division study. Further research will be needed to investigate the causes of the trend.
- Avoid complex inferential statistics, such as factor analysis or regression. Simple frequency tables or cross-tabulations will suffice to describe student outcomes. If more complex analyses are warranted, these can be reported in separate studies.
- Issue the reports regularly and broadly to the college community and encourage comments on the trends revealed in the data.

Using Results. The dissemination of simple, well-defined reports can increase awareness of the importance of student outcome assessment and focus necessary attention on the principal purpose of community colleges: to help students learn and reach their educational objectives. Perhaps the single most important role for presidents, then, is to insure that the results indicated by student tracking become integral to all the major decision-making processes of the institution, particularly the planning, budgeting, and hiring processes. Only when the results of student outcomes assessment inform college operations and plans for improvement will student tracking systems have accomplished the purposes for which institutions invest in them.

The current outcomes assessment movement places great expectations on the ability of colleges to generate longitudinal data on student flow and achievement. Computers and the technical skills of data managers will play an important role in meeting these expectations.

But outcomes assessment is a form of inquiry, not just a data collection task. Its success depends to a large degree on how clearly the goals of that inquiry are stated and how the results of the inquiry are used. As colleges develop student tracking systems in response to demands for outcomes information, presidents have the responsibility to insure that investment in data collection yields results and provides needed insights into how students use community colleges and how the college experience affects career and academic development.

Jim Palmer is the associate director of the Center for Community College Education at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia. He previously served as vice president for communications at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and assistant director for user services at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Volume 3, number 12
August 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 2344 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

NOT LEAVING TECHNOLOGY DECISIONS TO THE "TECHIES" AND "GURUS"

Carol Cross

A principal reason instructional technology has not achieved its potential to transform teaching and learning in community colleges is that so many educational leaders have kept their "hands-off" technology-related decisions. Many presidents and chief academic officers enthusiastically endorse the idea of using computer technology to improve teaching and learning, and they often point with pride to exemplary computer applications in their colleges. However, most real decision-making on technology-related, educational issues has been delegated to the director of computing, the dean "who has a PC at home," or to the faculty member "who has created some computer-based instruction."

By relegating discussions about technology to those who happen to be "gurus"—those interested and excited enough about technology to adopt it on their own—educational leaders are treating it as an issue apart, rather than as the means for other educational ends. For technology to be applied appropriately to community college education, a broad-based, well-informed, and comprehensive alteration of instructional methodologies that incorporates technological changes is necessary—one designed by the entire academic leadership, not just the "techies."

Accepting the Truths about Technology

To move forward on this issue, presidents and other academic leaders must abandon some widely-held myths about technology. The technology gurus and techies know the following two truths:

There is no such thing as an expert. While there certainly are individuals who are more familiar and comfortable than others with computers, interactive videodiscs, teleconferencing, and other technologies, few consider themselves really well-versed in all of them. Also, given the rapid rate of change, it is anybody's guess about what kinds of technology will be available for use in the next decade. Estimates are that fully 85 percent of the technology that will be in widespread use in the year 2000 has not even been invented yet. John Akers, John Sculley, Steven Jobs, Tom Peters, and John Nesbitt put together cannot assure either community college leaders or the nation at large what technology will look like in the next century. Leaders have little choice but to give up certainty and get into the fray.

The big issues surrounding technology are not technical questions, they are policy debates. The technologies of major computer vendors are moving towards convergence, and more devices can "talk to" more other devices all the time. It is becoming easier and easier to take the same digitized information and process it, use it, and send it via whichever technology is appropriate and available. Technology is becoming increasingly transparent to users. They no longer have to learn code to input commands; they now can push a button, touch a screen, or point and click with a mouse to operate things.

The techies are doing a great job of simplifying technology operations for neophytes. However, policymakers are not doing such a good job putting into place the new structures, procedures, and financial arrangements necessary to take advantage of the power of technology. Unfortunately, despite incontrovertible evidence that the information age is fundamentally changing the nature of education, too many community college leaders continue to operate the great majority of the college as "business as usual."

Issues Academic Leaders Need to Address

The following key educational issues are tied to technological development but are really policy issues, not technical questions. These are among the key issues that educational leaders need to address to ensure that their institutions take advantage of the technological resources and assistance available to them.

1. How Do Community Colleges Prepare to Serve the Nintendo Generation? Humorous stories about adults being trounced by nieces and grandchildren when playing Nintendo-like computer games are no longer laughing matters. Statistics show that elementary and preschool children are significantly different from baby-boomers and previous generations, demonstrating quicker response rates, better hand-eye coordination, and faster decision-making skills—presumably due to the hours many children have logged playing computer games that foster those characteristics.

While there is a downside to children's fascination with such media, the prevalence of technology has, nonetheless, helped to develop positive characteristics in the children who have access to its products. TVs, VCRs, computer games, and the like seem to be fostering children who are unintimidated by technology, even unfamiliar equipment; able to quickly synthesize fast-paced, multimedia information; capable of deciding and responding almost instantaneously; developing a larger

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

world view. However, these same devices may also be contributing to a generation that has lower interest and capabilities in reading; has a shorter attention span; expects immediate gratification; and is bored if not stimulated both visually and orally.

While the fields of child development and cognitive psychology are struggling to synthesize what is known in this area, it seems clear that the skills, capabilities, and interests of learners already in the educational pipeline are different from both those educational institutions are accustomed to serving, as well as different from those of educators themselves. What are community colleges going to do about this?

2. What Do We Teach in the Information Age? The debate on this topic has often been framed by current realities rather than future needs. One reading of the future is that technological developments erode the importance of facts and boost the requirements for associative, synthesizing, problem-solving, retrieval, and interpersonal skills. This is due to two different technological trends: 1) Technology is supporting unprecedented levels of information expansion. Current estimates are that the total sum of information in the entire world is doubling every eighteen months, and technology allows access to the entire mass; 2) In the workplace, mere conveyance of information can be done quicker, more accurately, and more cost-effectively by technology than by human beings. Most procedures that can be stated straightforwardly as "do this, then do that, then do that," can be computerized and mechanized.

Community colleges cannot focus their curricula on teaching information because there is just too much information to know, and it changes so rapidly that what was true yesterday is no longer true today. Computers are very good at storing massive amounts of data and retrieving the precise fact requested, which is why the jobs that involve supplying known information, such as bank tellers and telephone operators, are being automated along with low-level assembly positions. What computers cannot do—at least, not yet—is supply context, make creative linkages between different items of information, make value judgments, deal with the unexpected, or respond satisfactorily to personal interactions.

Education needs to learn how to accommodate these realities. Curricula must reflect what facts must be known and which can be looked up when they are needed. Effective instruction will concentrate both on how to look up facts and how to apply them creatively in the solution of real problems. Technology also adds a whole new wrinkle to the ongoing struggle with general education. Educators need to examine once again how to teach analytic, associative, problem-solving, and interpersonal skills. It turns out that instructional technology is extraordinarily well-equipped to develop some of these key skills in students, particularly in comparison to some traditional classroom methodologies.

3. How Do We Organize, Support, and Fund Individualized Instruction? Technology now offers cost-effective ways to individualize instruction for the masses. It has the capability of assessing the level of a student's incoming knowledge, strengths and weaknesses in skills, and a preferred style of learning, and then prescribing, tracking, and delivering a complete learning plan for each student. While this might be an optimal approach for a learner, it presents nightmares for administrators. If everyone is learning something different, how can they be tested and graded? How can instructors be convinced to accept the changes in relationships among them, their students, and the curriculum that such arrangements imply? If students master the material in shorter amounts of time, must they continue attending class for the semester? Can legislators be persuaded to change funding formulae currently based upon standard FTEs and student contact hours?

These, and other similar questions, are among the most essential issues academic leaders should be debating at this time. They are not questions that should be left only to those who have shown a predilection on their own for using technology but should involve the entire academic community. Yet presidents and other academic leaders will not be able to hold their own in such discussions unless they have a deeper comprehension of what technology is doing in the classroom and in the workplace. It appears to be time for community college leaders to reinvolve themselves in technology concerns that they have previously delegated to others.

There is no question that learning about technology, its current applications, and its potential for transforming teaching and learning takes time. It is both a fascinating and endlessly frustrating task. It requires tolerance for ambiguity; acceptance of uncertain knowledge; ability to adapt and seek alternative solutions; and skill in processing, synthesizing and applying endless amounts of information—the same skills that are demanded of community college students to succeed in the workplace transformed by technology. Community college leaders can reasonably argue that they simply do not have the time. However, those who expect their faculties and staffs to utilize technological tools but who are unwilling to spend the time and effort doing so personally are only kidding themselves. They are abdicating their roles as leaders. At best, they are only living up to the last option of Ted Turner's famous axiom, "Lead, follow, or get out of the way."

Carol Cross is corporate director of partnership development for SETS, a company that works cooperatively with colleges and universities to produce and implement videodisc-based interactive courseware. Previously, she served as the executive director of the AACJC Instructional Telecommunications Consortium. Cross writes on technology issues for Community College Week and other periodicals. She will conduct a major workshop, "The Many Faces of Multimedia: A Primer on Interactive Technologies," at the League for Innovation's annual conference on computing in community colleges, October 21-24, 1990, in Dallas, Texas.

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

STRENGTHENING THE TRANSFER FUNCTION: FROM A "ZERO-SUM" GAME TO A "WIN-WIN" SITUATION

Judith S. Eaton

Is the current emphasis on transfer education at community colleges a zero-sum game? Is transfer strengthened at the expense of other major community college functions such as developmental/remedial education or occupational training? Many fear that the answer to both questions is "yes," that today's efforts to strengthen the transfer function will in the long run weaken the community college's comprehensive scope.

Several factors contribute to the scenario of a zero-sum game. One is the fear that transfer will become the sole criterion used to assess institutional effectiveness. The second is the fear that transfer will become the predominant accountability measure employed by state and local funding sources, thus reducing financial support for other institutional functions. The third factor lies in the possibility that funds will be reallocated internally to strengthen transfer at the expense of other services. Each of these fears reflects the assumption that transfer is a distinct community college function which is strengthened only by weakening other programs.

These fears, however, need not become reality. College presidents are pivotal in ensuring that their institutions avoid this result. By recognizing the weak assumptions of the "zero-sum" game and leading their institutions in more positive directions, presidents can help create a "win-win" situation, with the result that efforts to strengthen transfer will strengthen the entire institution.

Transfer as an Effectiveness Criterion

Some anticipate that renewed interest in transfer involves the establishment of a single standard of excellence for community colleges: the success of students who pursue the baccalaureate. In this scenario, transfer activity as a sole criterion will replace the multiple measures colleges currently use to judge their effectiveness.

Those who express concern about transfer emerging as the sole criterion of community college effectiveness—including such commentators as K. Patricia Cross and Norton Grubb—acknowledge that they are anticipating what might occur rather than confirming that any change in standards has taken place. They provide those in leadership positions with an early warning. Recognizing that the community college mission is complex and cannot be neatly confined to any one standard or expectation, presidents must use their authority to sustain all major functions of the community college mission, including the transfer responsibility, the occupational responsibility, and the developmental/remedial responsibility. The American Association of Community and Junior College, through its designation of 1991 as the "year of transfer," reflects the type of commitment that is required. The establishment of the year of transfer is intended to encourage consideration of the importance of transfer for community college students within the context of an institution's comprehensive mission. It is essential that college presidents keep this vision of the community college mission as they deal with legislative and policy efforts to strengthen transfer. They cannot allow these efforts to eclipse the multipurpose nature of the community college.

Fiscal Accountability

If transfer becomes the sole effectiveness criterion, then state and local funding agencies might stress transfer success as the key measure of accountability for community colleges. Thus, funding for community colleges would become solely dependent on transfer. This raises the possibility that financial support will be withdrawn from those institutions whose emphasis on transfer is deemed inadequate.

At first glance, these fears may appear to have some grounding. State and local governments are challenging community colleges to manage transfer more effectively, to collect and use transfer data meaningfully, and to revitalize the transfer relationship with receiving four-year institutions. But upon closer inspection, these challenges cannot be interpreted as a mandate to abandon the comprehensive mission. Few, if any, government officials insist that funding be channeled directly to transfer efforts at the expense of other programs and services. Indeed, community college leaders have done an outstanding job of convincing government agencies that occupational education and training are vital to economic and work force development. Legislatures, cities, and counties are not urging community colleges to abandon these highly successful programs for the sake of transfer. College leaders need to recognize this and view government calls for a renewed emphasis on transfer as a reaffirmation of the comprehensive mission.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Internal Allocation of Funds

The limited resources available to community colleges engender concern that additional emphasis on transfer will result in a reallocation of funds away from other vital community college services. Institutions might reallocate resources among programs, making additional dollars available to transfer efforts and decreasing the budgets of developmental or vocational programs. In addition, colleges might confine the hiring of new staff to those who contribute to the transfer effort.

While such allocations appear feasible, they are in reality unlikely to have a major impact. In the first place, presidents do not have unlimited power to effect this financial reinvestment, especially if it will result in the elimination of programs or in staff layoffs. Efforts to reallocate funds on a narrow basis will also be hampered by the blurred boundaries between programs identified as "occupational" or "academic." Transfer is a function of student intent rather than course content and is undertaken by students in all courses and programs, including those in occupational, as well as academic, areas. Indeed, successful occupational programs often serve as outstanding models for transfer effectiveness because they share several key characteristics that enhance student flow and transfer: program coherence, clear program goals, specific transfer agreements with departments at four-year institutions, and the challenge of external licensure or certification requirements. At the course level, many of the requirements and electives in occupational areas are transferrable to four-year institutions. In short, transfer and nontransfer functions are not neatly partitioned.

Transfer as a Win-Win Situation

It is important for presidents to recognize the weak assumptions upon which the zero-sum scenario rests and to prevent this scenario from deterring efforts to strengthen the transfer function. But this will not suffice to ensure the success of those efforts. Presidents must also work to assure that they are carried out in a win-win framework, with benefits accruing to the entire institution. There are four ways that college presidents can foster this win-win scenario.

Achievement. First, presidents should use transfer to emphasize the importance of student achievement. Few doubt the seriousness of the community college's commitment to access, but many question the effectiveness of access unless it is matched by an equally strong commitment to achievement. Increased emphasis on transfer is one way community colleges can focus on the longer-range educational goals of students and thus make a major institutional investment in responsibility for student success after admission to the college. This is particularly important for disadvantaged students.

Student-Centeredness. Second, presidents can ensure a win-win situation by making student success an essential feature of their institutions' student-centeredness. Community colleges, as premier teaching institutions, are models for other colleges and universities in placing students at the center of their educational work and thought. But because of the challenges posed by a student population with varying backgrounds and capacities, community college educators sometimes worry that setting high expectations for student success, however well-intended, might discourage some students who are unsure of their skills and abilities. It is important to recognize that the values implied in ambitious educational goals can help make student success an important element of student-centeredness. Attention to support services and formative evaluation can help assure that students will not be discouraged or deterred from pursuing their studies.

Cooperation. A third way to ensure a win-win situation is to stress emphasis on transfer as a means of building institutional cooperation across program and service lines, thus diminishing the "other-side-of-the-house" syndrome that plagues many colleges. Emphasizing transfer as one of many forms of student achievement can diminish competition between programs and services within the college and encourage a sense of shared responsibility. Teaching and learning do not flourish in a "clash-of-opposites" environment. They are best nurtured by stressing the shared responsibilities of faculty and academic administrators.

Leadership. Finally, presidents can build a win-win scenario through their personal leadership styles and through straightforwardness in stating their views and values. Transfer is not an appropriate emphasis for all community colleges. But at those institutions which believe the emphasis to be desirable, presidents have the responsibility to involve both "occupational" and "academic" faculty, to forcefully articulate the value of student achievement as well as access, and to pursue the financing of transfer interest within the context of a balanced implementation of the institutional mission.

Making A Difference

Presidential leadership does make a difference. The critical question to be asked is: in what way? The behaviors, attitudes, and values of presidents are essential to ensuring that the recent emphasis on transfer education is sustained not as a zero-sum gain for institutions but as a win-win situation for students, faculty, administrators, the college, and the community. Those who cling to the zero-sum scenario misunderstand today's efforts to improve transfer and hence miss an opportunity to reaffirm the community college's traditional commitment to student achievement, student centeredness, and interdepartmental cooperation.

Judith S. Eaton is director of the National Center for Academic Achievement and Transfer at the American Council on Education. She previously served as president of the Community College of Philadelphia and Clark County Community College.

Volume 3, number 14
September 1990

[Editor's note: *Leadership Abstracts* is pleased to have Jim Palmer serve as guest editor for this and future issues of the series. Jim is associate director of the Center for Community College Education at George Mason University.]

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

LEADING A COLLEGE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Stephen G. Katsinas and Vincent A. Lacey

While community colleges cannot solve all of the economic woes of the nation or their communities, they have taken on a number of economic development initiatives outside of the regular, credit curriculum. These nontraditional initiatives include, but are not limited to, customized training and retraining for area businesses, technology transfer efforts, new business incubators, and small business centers. Often the colleges serve as the primary training agencies for government-sponsored labor force development programs, with payment based on students' performance and employment success. For example, preliminary results of a national survey of community colleges released in June, 1990 by NETWORK (America's Two-Year College Employment, Training and Adult Literacy Consortium) found that community colleges are now the largest single provider of training supported by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

Unlike the regular credit programs offered by the colleges, these economic development initiatives are not always bound by the traditions of college organization and administration. Many are offered through divisions, centers, and institutes that are spin-offs of the institution and are not under the control of the dean of instruction. Because these programs increase the visibility of the college in the business community, those who manage them often report directly to the president. In addition, many operate on a break-even or for-profit basis and do not have a direct impact on the college's subsidized enrollment base, though the indirect effect may be significant.

These nontraditional approaches speak well for the ability of community colleges to address pressing economic development problems, especially those posed by a growing underclass whose skills leave them unable to join the economic mainstream. Clearly, getting this message out to policy makers—particularly to state and local officials who manage employment and training programs funded with federal "flow-through" dollars—is of great importance to community college leaders interested in helping the work force become more competitive.

Leading Economic Development

There are six steps community college leaders, particularly presidents, can take to establish effective economic development programs.

1. Providing the Presidential Imprimatur. It is the personal commitment of the president that either promotes an environment of risk-taking and innovation or constricts it. Therefore, the first step required of the president is to communicate his or her personal support of the college's economic development program. If faculty do not realize that the nontraditional program is the president's program, it will soon have a second-class citizenship within the college's informal culture. Without strong presidential support, the natural resistance to new ways of doing things can overwhelm a fledgling economic development initiative.

2. Serving the Nation's Underclass. Because economic development is tied to human resource development, the president, with the full support of the board of trustees, should clearly articulate that the institution's role in economic development includes serving disadvantaged student clienteles. Many, if not most, community college mission statements make a commitment "to take students as they are," and it is true that these individuals have been served in various model programs targeted to special populations. Yet community colleges have infrequently, if at all, targeted significant programs or services for the underclass represented, for example, by the four million Americans receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (of whom only 150,000 are served by Title IIA of the Job Training Partnership Act). Indeed, mission statements rarely require the colleges to reach out to the underclass through employment services, job training, and adult literacy education.

The role of the president here is simple and direct. If the institution is going to become committed to economic development, it must be committed to helping the underclass to gain an economic foothold in society. This priority should be articulated in the institution's mission statement.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

3. ***Defending the Liberal Arts.*** If colleges are to serve the underclass, a third step to be taken is to reaffirm the importance of the liberal arts curriculum. Many, particularly faculty, fear that an emphasis on economic development will overshadow the college's other educational functions. Community college chief executive officers need to be sensitive to the relationship of the liberal arts program to democratic values. In addition, presidents must guard against those who use the rubric of economic development to diminish the importance of liberal and general education. Given today's fast rate of technological change, the adaptation and critical thinking skills one gains from the liberal arts are essential to community college students. Nontraditional economic development activities should promote enrollments in liberal arts courses for this reason, providing a rationale and vehicle for "selling" such courses to students.

4. ***Initiating Economic Development Audits.*** As a fourth step, presidents should initiate "economic development audits" for both the institution and the community. These audits should identify training and adult literacy opportunities in the community, thus assuring that the college will not "reinvent the wheel" when planning economic development initiatives. In addition to examining the local resources, these audits should include action statements specifying how existing services offered by the institution may be repackaged to serve the community better. Such repackaging can often be accomplished through an institutional division that lies outside of the traditional transfer, community services, and occupational education departments.

5. ***Securing Adequate Funding.*** Money is always a concern, and the president should calculate whether the college has the financial support required for its economic development program, or whether funding needs to be secured from alternative sources. Subsidies from government agencies that oversee job training, welfare reform, or adult literary are often available. With proper packaging of existing funds from various federal, state, local, and private sector discretionary programs, the necessary finances can usually be arranged. Spin-off benefits, including higher revenues through increased enrollment, are another source of income. For example, one large urban community college estimates that 25 percent of the participants in the various nontraditional job training and adult literacy programs delivered by the college during 1989-1990 will enroll in regular, credit programs over the next year and one half. Thus, institutional finances can be dramatically improved through economic development initiatives. It is here that the economic development audit can make a critically important contribution to program planning.

6. ***Influencing Policy Decisions.*** Finally the president should be an active player in economic development efforts, seeking to influence the role community colleges play in government economic development policies at both the state and federal levels. This can be accomplished through personal involvement in the National Council for Occupational Education or the National Council for Resource Development. Affiliated with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, both provide a visible forum for discussion of issues that affect the ability of community colleges to serve as catalysts for economic development. Presidents should also support and play an active role in the federal relations program operated jointly by AACJC and the Association of Community College Trustees. The program helps guide legislation that affects labor force and economic development.

Building Community

Leading the economic development program requires the college president to take on several roles. He or she must be the leading voice for nontraditional approaches to community problems, while at the same time assuring the integrity of traditional college functions in the liberal arts and general education. In addition, the president must work hand-in-hand with the business community and at the same time serve those who have only a tenuous foothold on the American dream. The roles of fund raiser and lobbyist also must be attended to.

But the payoff for this work can be considerable, for in the final analysis, economic development is community development. When a community college prepares individuals for jobs that pay in excess of $15,000 (above the $14,500 federal poverty standard for a family of four), the institution is building community. When a community college plays a positive role in attracting new industries to a community or helping an existing industry to survive competitively, the institution is building community. And when a community college provides employment and training programs that assist individuals who have been traditionally unserved or under served by institutions of higher education, the institution is not only building community, but enriching the state and nation. Properly led, economic development initiatives accrue benefits far beyond the increased good will and visibility enjoyed by the college.

Stephen G. Katsinas is assistant professor of higher education at Oklahoma State University. Vincent A. Lacey is director of the computer-assisted instructional laboratory at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. *This abstract summarizes key points in their 1989 monograph, Economic Development and Community Colleges: Models of Institutional Effectiveness, which is available from the Publications Office at AACJC.*

Volume 3, number 15
September 1990

Jim Palmer, guest editor

Don Doucette: editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION ON THE GRILL

Dan Angel

The changes sweeping across the globe are not limited to the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Gone too is the era when the American public held higher education in universal high regard. A recent Gallup poll found that public confidence in educational leaders was only 31 percent. In 1983, *A Nation at Risk* set the tone for public concern for all levels of education. The report also helped expose higher education to rigorous examination, and in the intervening years, public criticism has focused on four major areas: 1) high costs, 2) uncertain quality, 3) confusion of goals, and 4) inadequate response to key problems.

American higher education is on the grill, and its leadership needs not only to recognize the seriousness of the criticisms leveled against it, but also to respond to substantive concerns and to change where criticisms are justified. Community colleges, perhaps the least well-understood segment of higher education, have come under particularly intense scrutiny and criticism, and it is urgent that their leaders take seriously public pressures for accountability and respond by improving both their message and their programs to meet the changing challenges and expectations of the 1990s.

Criticism One: High Costs

Higher education has come under serious criticism for increases in tuition and other costs that far exceed rates of inflation. Large numbers of column inches have been devoted to this issue. A more substantive indicator of public concern is that 30 state legislatures have acted to develop programs and policies to guarantee that students can afford to attend college. In 1986, Michigan became the first state to set up a special fund guaranteeing tuition payments for future students. Florida and Wyoming have since enacted "Michigan-style" plans to guarantee student tuition. Twenty-seven states have followed a "Texas-style" approach, where bonds are sold that are tax free when used for higher education.

In 1989-90, the average annual tuition for a private four-year college was $8,738. For a public four-year institution, it was $1,694, and at a public community college, the average annual tuition for full-time enrollment was $842. These data show that community colleges are less vulnerable to criticisms of excessive costs, but it would be a mistake to conclude that they must not be sensitive to consumer concerns. Community college leaders must work to keep costs down and educational opportunities accessible. At the same time, they must demonstrate convincingly that consumers are getting a good value for their money—which leads to the second major criticism of higher education.

Criticism Two: Uncertain Quality

There is mounting evidence that the public needs to be reassured that higher education is a good investment. Students, parents of students, and public officials need to be assured that colleges provide a substantive, quality educational experience that produces concrete results.

The public concern for quality control is probably most evident in the nationwide movement toward competency testing. In the 1980s, several states established some kind of testing program to ensure both that a college education is "college-level," and that college adds value—students emerge from college with more knowledge and greater skills than they entered with.

Texas has recently joined New Jersey, Tennessee, and Florida in mandating a statewide test for its college students. The Texas test does three things: tests basic skills in reading, writing, and math; prevents students from enrolling in junior-level courses with deficient skills; and mandates remedial courses to correct deficiencies. While such "rising junior" tests do not directly address issues of value added by college, they do tend to guarantee that a college degree means that a student has achieved some minimum level of competency.

The whole testing movement is a verification of the public suspicion that higher education may not be worth it. In this regard, a 1986 study that offered an economic gauge to the value of a college education is enormously useful. The study demonstrated a $300 monthly earnings differential for each level of education achieved: the lifetime earnings of a high school dropout would be about $300 a month less than for a high school graduate A community college degree recipient will make $300 per month more than a high school graduate, and so on up the line. In fact, the increments grew larger at higher levels of education to reflect the incomes earned by professionals such as attorneys and doctors.

Community college leaders have a dual responsibility in responding to public concerns about quality. The first is to do a better job communicating the value of a

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

college education to their constituencies. Their second responsibility is to document the effectiveness of their programs in terms of real student outcomes. Most community colleges leaders understand that theaccountability movement is here to stay, and many have already begun implementing systematic programs for assessing institutional effectiveness. Community colleges have much to offer the rest of higher education in this regard, and their leadership in identifying clearly the intended and realized outcomes of college will benefit all.

Criticism Three: Confusing Goals

A third criticism heaped upon higher education is that there is no single voice clearly articulating the goals that colleges and universities have for themselves and the nation. In the past year, President Bush identified six goals for higher education. Secretary Cavazos identified six of his own. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges presented six objectives to its members, and the Education Commission of the States published its own agenda. Regional accreditation bodies also have their agendas for higher education; for instance, the Southern Educational Regional Board that covers Texas, has identified twelve things they want to accomplish during the next decade. Finally, each of the fifty states has its own list of higher education priorities.

While this diversity attests to the independent spirit that has made American higher education the envy of the world, this multiplicity of goals must be confusing to its various publics who want clear messages. Most of the goals published by various states and organizations do not conflict, but the image created by so many voices is one of an unruly collection of individual institutions. The higher education community badly needs to clarify to the American public its answers to basic questions: what are colleges and universities doing? what should they be doing? how can higher education help create a better society and a better world?

Criticism Four: Inadequate Response to Key Problems

Perhaps the most damaging a criticism is that higher education has not been perceived as contributing effectively to the solution of critical problems facing the nation. Political, business, and community leaders have lately come to recognize that an inadequately prepared work force is a major threat to the economic well being of the nation. They have come to recognize that the exclusion of large and growing numbers of at-risk students from participation in higher education programs further threatens economic competitiveness. Community colleges, as the open access institutions with the most experience dealing with at-risk students, bear a special burden for responding to this criticism. They also have a unique opportunity to achieve long-term public support for higher education by helping to solve the nation's looming educational and economic problems.

It is ironic that the public, the business community in particular, are suddenly demanding solutions to the problem of high school dropouts. High dropout rates are not a recent phenomenon. In fact, the highest retention rate ever achieved was in 1970, and that year the graduation rate was only 77 percent. American business did not notice that at best, twenty-three percent of the nation's youth were dropping out of school because they did not need educated agricultural workers nor did they need particularly well-educated factory workers. However, in a keenly competitive global economy, the nation cannot afford the luxury of having a quarter of its young adults underprepared for the work force. In 1985 it took 11.8 years of education to qualify for a job. By the year 2000, it will take 14 years, and 90 percent of the new jobs created will require some higher education.

In addition to serving dropouts, higher education is being asked to solve problems of adult illiteracy and to help improve the lot of minorities who remain underrepresented at all levels of educational achievement. Between 1974 and 1985, the number of Black high school graduates increased by 19 percent, but Black college enrollment dropped 12 percent. Between 1974 and 1985, college attendance of Hispanics rose 21 percent, but the participation rate of this fast-growing minority rate actually dropped 36 percent. Colleges and universities are also being asked to educate the rapidly increasing numbers of older student seeking to retrain or to make up for previous lack of educational opportunities.

To regain public confidence, higher education must adapt itself to assist in solving these problems. It must prepare a competitive work force by reaching out to include and educate effectively populations of students who have previously been excluded. This challenge plays to the long suit of community colleges, and they have a special responsibility for leading the resurgence of higher education in the 1990s.

That much of the future of American higher education is riding on the shoulders of the nation's community colleges may be scary, but also raises chill bumps of excitement. The public and the nation demand committed and focused leadership to address the major educational, economic, and social issues of the times. They demand educators who refuse to be mired in administrivia, in turf battles, and in other pettiness. They demand nothing less than a recommitment to advancing the American dream—where education still represents the best opportunity for all to gain their fair share of the economic pie.

Dan Angel is president of Austin Community College, Austin, Texas. This essay is abstracted from his remarks delivered at the Emerging Leaders Institute, University of Michigan, February 14, 1990, in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Volume 3, number 16
October 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

AMERICA'S CHOICE: HIGH SKILLS OR LOW WAGES

Tom Gonzales

America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages is a startling report that has major implications for the role of community colleges in preparing the nation's workforce for the challenges of a new world economic order. The Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, published in June 1990 by the National Center on Education and the Economy, is startling because it vividly documents concerns about the nation's ability to compete economically and rejects most glib rationalizations that have been used to excuse the failings of the American workforce and educational system.

The task force, composed of 34 individuals from all sectors of business and education and co-chaired by two former secretaries of the U. S. Department of Labor, argues that improving productivity is the only chance the country has to raise, or even maintain, its current standard of living. However, in the past two decades, real productivity growth has slowed to a crawl, relying almost entirely on women entering the workforce and creating two-wage-earner families in order to maintain current standards of living. The commission concludes that if productivity continues to falter that the country can expect only one of two futures: either the top 30 percent of the population will grow wealthier while the bottom 70 percent becomes progressively poorer, or all will slide into relative poverty together.

Problems and Recommendations

The report grapples with key issues related to effective workforce preparation, including skills shortages in the existing and projected workforce, how work is organized in American companies (and alternative forms of effective organization), and how workers are prepared (or not prepared) for the workplace. Then, it distills these issues into discrete problems followed by specific recommendations to address them.

Problem One. Two factors stand in the way of producing the highly educated workforce that is required to increase American productivity: lack of a clear standard of achievement for all students and lack of motivation for students to work hard in school. One reason that students going right to work after school have little motivation to study hard is that they see little or no relationship between how well they do in school and what kind of job they get after school. Other advanced industrial nations have stringent performance standards that virtually all students must meet at about age sixteen and that directly affect their employment prospects.

Recommendation One. A new educational performance standard should be set for all students, to be met by age sixteen. This standard should be established nationally and benchmarked to the highest in the world. Students passing a series of performance-based assessments that incorporate the standard would be awarded a Certificate of Initial Mastery. This certificate would qualify the student to choose among going to work, entering a college preparatory program, or studying for a Technical and Professional Certificate, which would be explicitly tied to advanced job requirements. These standards would not be intended as sorting mechanisms, but would allow multiple opportunities for success; the goal would simply be to ensure achievement of high performance standards for the great majority of the nation's workforce.

Problem Two. More than 20 percent of students drop out of high school—almost 50 percent in many cities. Yet, these dropouts make up more than one-third of the front-line workforce. Ignoring these dropouts is tantamount to ignoring the future workforce.

Recommendation Two. The states should take the responsibility to ensure that virtually all students achieve the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Through newly created local employment and training boards, states, with federal assistance, should create and fund alternative learning environments for those who cannot reach this standard in regular schools. Youth centers and other alternative structures should be established to enroll high school dropouts and help them reach the standard.

Problem Three. Other industrial nations have multiyear career-oriented educational programs that prepare students to operate at a professional level in the workplace. Graduates of these programs hit the ground running when they get their first full-time jobs at age nineteen or twenty. In the U. S., only a tiny fraction of non-college-bound students are explicitly prepared for work. Most flounder in the labor market, moving from low-paying job to low-paying job until their mid-twenties, never being seriously trained.

Recommendation Three. A comprehensive system of Technical and Professional Certificates and associate's degrees should be created for an entire range of service and manufacturing occupations aimed at the majority of students and adult workers who do not pursue baccalau-

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

reate degrees. Students could earn entry-level certificates after completing two- or four-year programs, which combine general education, specific occupation skills, and a significant work component. Students could earn advanced certificates, attesting to mastery of more complex skills, as they advance in their careers. Students could pursue these programs at a wide variety of institutions accredited to offer them, including high schools, community colleges, and proprietary schools. The system should be designed to allow students to move easily between college and certificate programs, and financing should be provided to assist students to complete their programs.

Problem Four. The vast majority of American employers are not moving to high-performance work organizations, nor are they investing in training their non-managerial employees for these new kinds of organizations. Most remain committed to mass production models that do not require high skills of their employees, models that are ill-suited to compete in a world market that demands high quality, variety and responsiveness to changing consumer tastes, and rapid new-product introductions. Other nations are moving much more quickly to high-performance models and are training front-line workers, funded in part by public revenues.

Recommendation Four. All employers should be given incentives and assistance to invest in the further education and training of their workers and to pursue high-productivity forms of work organization. A system should be established whereby all employers invest at least one percent of their payroll in worker training. Public, technical assistance should be provided to small businesses to assist them to move away from assembly-line models to high-performance work organizations.

Problem Five. The U. S. is not well-organized to prepare the highly skilled workers needed to support high-performance work organizations. Public policy on worker training has been largely passive, except for assisting a small portion of severely disadvantaged individuals. Policies, administration, and service delivery are fragmented, and there is virtually no cohesive system to assist school-to-work transition.

Recommendation Five. A new, comprehensive system to make skills development and upgrading for the majority of all workers a central aim of public policy should be established. It should include a system of employment and training boards, established as federal, state, and local partnerships, to organize and oversee new school-to-work transition programs, including youth centers and "second chance" programs for adults seeking the Certificate of Initial Mastery. These boards would be responsive to the needs of their local constituencies and would manage local labor market information, a local job service, and a system for awarding Technical and Professional Certificates at the local level. The boards would coordinate with existing programs, and the states would create a parallel structure to support the local boards, coordinate statewide functions, and establish state standards for their operation.

Implications for Community Colleges

The report concludes in no uncertain terms that the nation is headed for serious economic and social dislocation unless it commits itself to a program to educate and train its workforce to high standards and reorganizes its work organizations to meet the high productivity demands of the changing world economy. The nation can no longer operate a high-wage and low-skill model and maintain or improve its standard of living. Taken together, the commission's recommendations provide a framework for developing a high quality American education and training system that can support new, high-performance work organizations.

Community colleges certainly have a major role to play in the development and implementation of the comprehensive school-to-work and education and training systems that the commission recommends. In fact, community colleges are uniquely positioned to respond to the recommendations. They are local institutions with strong ties to both secondary schools and four-year colleges and universities. Perhaps alone among postsecondary institutions, community colleges offer both strong transfer programs in preparation for further study toward a bachelor's degree and a comprehensive set of occupation programs that lead to certificates and degrees indicating competence in job skills that are tied to the needs of local business and industry. They also have considerable experience in providing "second chance" programs for working adults.

In sum, no educational institutions at any level are better suited to assist the broad-based, national implementation of the commission's recommendations than community colleges—which are located within commuting distance of more than 90 percent of the American population. However, as the commission had no illusions that its recommendations, which call for a major overhaul of both the nation's educational and business and industry establishments, would be quickly implemented, community colleges can have no illusions that they will be recognized as major partners in solving the problems facing the nation. Community colleges need to make the recommendations of the commission part of their national agenda. They need to articulate clearly the role they have to play in implementing the recommendations and to persist in seeking to accomplish the pragmatic solutions laid out by the commission.

As the commission concludes: "The status quo is not an option. The choice we have is to become a nation of high skills or one of low wages. The choice is ours. It should be clear. It must be made." (p. 9)

Tom Gonzales is chancellor of the Seattle Community Colleges and past president of Linn-Benton Community College. He served as the sole community college representative on the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce which produced the report summarized in this abstract.

Volume 3, number 17
November 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 2543 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

IMPLEMENTING A DIVERSITY RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM

Laura I. Rendón

Bob Dylan said it best: "the times they are a changing." Indians, African Americans, and Hispanics are now 18 million strong, 20 percent of the nation. Some of America's major cities, including Los Angeles and San Antonio, have "minority majorities"—populations of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians that, when combined, outnumber the white population.

Community colleges, which perhaps enroll the most varied student clientele in all of higher education, are not new to diversity. While only 36 percent of all white college students were enrolled in two-year institutions during the fall of 1988, 56 percent of all Hispanic college students were enrolled at community colleges, as were 54 percent of all American Indian college students, 40 percent of all Asian college students and 42 percent of all African American college students. But there is mounting concern that few minority students successfully transfer to four-year colleges and that full equity in terms of degree completion has yet to be attained. In its 1990 report, *Education that Works*, the Quality Education for Minorities project reported that while Hispanic, Black, and Indian students represented 14 percent of college and university enrollments in 1986, yet these minority groups received just nine percent of all bachelor's degrees, eight percent of master's degrees and six percent of all doctoral degrees. In fact, white students earn bachelor's degrees at twice the rate of African American students and three times the rate of Hispanic students.

Community college presidents must exert leadership to turn the college into an institution that is responsive to multicultural student populations. This cannot be done on a piecemeal basis. A diversity restructuring program is needed, leading to improvements in governance, curriculum, instruction, student support services, and faculty development. College leaders can take several steps outlined below, to assure that these programs effect the institutional change needed to improve our track record in helping minority students achieve their educational goals.

A Diversity Restructuring Program

Employ a Shared Governance Model. Organizations of all types are now opting for adaptable and less bureaucratic modes of management. In education, school systems at the K-12 levels have already experimented with participatory management models that decentralize power and allow the involvement of all key players in school management. For example, the school restructuring plan developed by James Comer at Yale University vastly improved the performance of two New Haven schools that held the city's worst student achievement and attendance records. Comer's model focused on student development and established a participatory school management system in which administrators share power with parents, teachers and support staff.

Community college presidents can employ Comer's model by creating teams of faculty, administrators, support staff, and community representatives who are given the opportunity to help transform the college into an exemplary campus. These teams could study and document changes in the college's student clientele, review the college mission to ensure that it is responsive to multicultural populations, and examine the college budget with an eye toward funding activities that improve faculty development, ease relationships with feeder schools and four-year institutions, and encourage innovative strategies for fostering student learning.

Create a Multicultural Curriculum. The president should work closely with the chief academic officer to ensure that multicultural perspectives are reflected throughout the curriculum. Ethnic studies programs are helpful, but it is more important to caution the faculty against overrelying on a European-centered curriculum that ignores the contributions made by minorities in history, science, art and literature. Johnetta Cole, president of Spelman College, notes that if Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Indian faculty members can teach European and American history and literature, white faculty members can cover minority voices in diverse disciplines.

Strengthen and Reward the Faculty. Leadership is needed to make the faculty aware of the new populations they will teach and of the steps faculty can take to respond to the learning styles of multicultural populations. Often faculty resist changing their teaching philosophy and overly rely on the lecture method. This creates a passive classroom environment and ignores cultural as well as learning style differences. The president should work closely with the chief academic officer and faculty teams to design a faculty development program that trains instructors in the use of varied and active learning techniques, such as debates, interactive video, simulations, and case studies. Faculty should also be trained in the use of quantitative and qualitative assessment and in the ways those assessments can improve teaching and learning.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Along with professional development, the president and chief academic officer should support faculty inquiry into models of teaching and learning. The concept of the teacher/scholar, discussed by Ernest Boyer in the *New American Scholar*, should be encouraged through activities such as teaching residencies, work with master teacher or summer programs that help faculty design new materials and learn innovative instructional methods. Steps to enhance the role of the teacher scholar should be matched by efforts to reward faculty for extraordinary student outcomes.

Develop Mentoring Programs. Retention research indicates that what goes on outside the classroom is often as important as what goes on inside the classroom. A mentoring program that pairs students with the college's professional staff can provide students with guidance about college majors, careers and transfer opportunities. Mentors can also provide students with needed support and encouragement. It is the president who conveys the importance of the mentoring program. At Colorado's Front Range Community College, for example, president Cary Israel regularly mentors minority students and encourages key administrators to follow his example.

Improve Campus Climate and Diversify the Staff. Recently, minority students have been the victims of racial slurs, caricatures, and insensitive remarks from students and faculty. These incidents point to the need for presidential leadership aimed at creating a positive, nurturing campus climate for the multicultural student clientele. College teams should establish courses and seminars that address issues of race relations, develop policies prohibiting racial and sex discrimination, and establish grievance procedures. Efforts to sensitize faculty and staff to the concerns of multicultural students are also needed.

Increasing the representation of minorities within the college's faculty and professional staff will be important, helping to assure that there are role models for minority students and that the college staff appreciates and understands the cultural backgrounds of diverse students. Currently, Black faculty represent only about four percent of the nation's professoriate; Hispanic faculty constitute only two percent, and American Indians comprise less than one percent. The president should monitor hiring procedures and assure that recruitment extends to minority candidates. The president can also mentor new leaders on campus and encourage faculty and counselors who are interested in becoming administrators to participate in leadership development institutes for women and minorities. Examples include the leadership institutes that are currently funded by the Ford Foundation and operated at North Carolina State University, Texas A&M University, and the University of Michigan, as well as those funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and conducted by the League for Innovation and The University of Texas at Austin.

Strengthen the College Transfer Function. The transfer function is critical to minority students wishing to attain bachelor's and graduate degrees. Thus, the college president must provide the leadership and the vision needed to turn the college into a viable conduit toward the baccalaureate. Transfer centers, such as those operated by the California community colleges; articulation agreements; and academic alliances involving high school, community college, and four-year college faculty, are promising efforts. Nonetheless, more innovations are needed. The creation of the "Higher Education Mall" at Macomb Community College, which enables students to complete bachelor's degree programs on the two-year college campus, is an example.

Develop an Action Plan and a Research Agenda. Besides working to improve faculty development, instruction, and the institutional climate, the president should ensure that the college and all departments have recruitment and retention goals that specify how many students should graduate and how many students should transfer to four-year institutions. Action strategies to meet these goals should be delineated and a plan to monitor progress toward achieving these goals should be in place. The action plan will serve as a base against which the college can assess its efforts to improve student achievement.

To design a cure, it is first necessary to understand the cause. Hence research is a requisite component of a college's action plan. The college president should work closely with key administrators, faculty, and the institutional research officer to develop a research agenda addressing such questions as: Why are minority students leaving the college? How can campus climate be improved? What is the college transfer rate? How can retention and transfer rates be improved? In what disciplines are minority students having the best and least success? The results of studies designed to answer these questions should be carefully evaluated with an eye toward improving practice and policy. The president could also initiate a research partnership with four-year institutions, allowing graduate students to use the community college campus as a living research laboratory.

Changing demography is having an impact on the way institutions are managed and on the overall campus climate and instruction. If community colleges are to stay in step or ahead of the times, they must adapt to change. This will require strong, visionary, and creative leadership from the college president. Multicultural students deserve a fair chance to develop their capacities to be productive, well-educated citizens. Community college presidents can help to ensure that the college is transformed into an exemplary campus at which all students have an equal opportunity to become winners.

Laura I. Rendón is associate professor, Department of Adult and Community College Education, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Volume 3, number 18
November 1990

Jim Palmer, guest editor, is associate director of the Center for Community College Education, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

TIME TO TEACH A NEW WORLD: EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Lucie J. Fjeldstad

Much has been said and written about the enormity of the challenges facing the nation, in particular, its educational institutions and its business and industry. Considerably less emphasis has been given to the common interest that these organizations, including community colleges, have in working together toward common goals—not simply the obvious goal of developing an educated work force, but of nurturing a sophisticated citizenry capable of exercising civic responsibility in a rich and humane culture.

Some corporations, including IBM, share with community colleges a commitment to excellence in education and an understanding that the challenges posed by the new century will require both resources and resourcefulness. Properly applied, computer technology can help meet these challenges; it can help community colleges to teach a new world.

A New World

Among other characteristics, the new world will be defined by the changing racial and ethnic makeup of the country. By the year 2050, for example, the average U. S. resident will trace his or her roots to Africa, Asia, the Hispanic world, or the Pacific Islands. Already, in California, New York, and Florida, the majority of elementary and secondary school children belongs to an ethnic or racial minority. These students—including large numbers of immigrants—often bring with them the challenges of cultural transition, economic disadvantage, and a native language other than English

To teach such students effectively, educators must develop creative teaching techniques that work for people of a variety of languages, cultures, and backgrounds.

The Human Capital Crisis. The country also faces what many are calling a human capital crisis—a crisis whose causes are many and sometimes mysterious—but whose symptoms include disturbingly high illiteracy and drop-out rates and epidemic drug abuse. It is difficult to exaggerate the severity of this crisis or its impact on the education and business communities.

American business needs educated employees to make and sell its products. A company like IBM needs well-educated consumers to make use of them. For IBM and companies like it around the globe, a world-class work force and an informed consumer population are strategic imperatives—a matter of survival. Beyond this, an educated populace helps assure a free and just society, democratic ideals, and the future of its children.

But in the United States today, an estimated 27 million people are functionally illiterate. Around the globe, that figure is a staggering 800 million. By the year 2000, this number is expected to top one billion people. Coupled with this is a national drop-out rate of 29 percent. According to the Children's Defense Fund, every eight seconds of the school day, an American student drops out. This is one million students per year. Of the total who do graduate annually, 700,000 cannot read their diplomas.

An Information Society. In this context, consider the fact that every two to three years, society's knowledge base virtually doubles. Every day, some 7,000 scientific and technical articles are published. Information-gathering satellites send back enough data to fill the nineteen million volumes in the Library of Congress to overflowing—every two weeks! On any given Sunday, a single copy of the *New York Times* holds more information than this nation's colonial American ancestors were required to absorb in a lifetime.

Ironically, this urgent need to be information savvy is happening when the ability to process information—that is, when the strength of the nation's human capital—seems less and less able to do so. The good news is that at the time when the need to "manage" information—to store, retrieve, search, organize, and analyze it in order to learn and make informed decisions—is so acute, there is technology available that is equal to the task.

Multimedia Technology and the Campus of the Future

Today, interactive multimedia technology brings sight, sound, and touch to computers. Such technology offers a potent way to meet the diverse needs of the full range of students enrolled in community colleges. On the one hand, multimedia technology can be used to teach reading and writing skills to remedial students; on the other, higher-level students can do the most sophisticated chemistry laboratory experiments, for example,

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

at their multimedia computer workstations. Multimedia technology is also well-suited to address the emerging needs of distance learners, part-time students and faculty, and other challenges facing community colleges

The future of education envisioned by IBM is a campus linked by high-speed, fiber-optic technology and multimedia computer applications. Such a campus will offer students powerful educational opportunities, whether their field of study is history, science, or music.

For example, three times a week, Kelly, a music major, studies with Kim, a prominent Korean piano master. Kelly lives in California and studies music at Bakersfield College. Kim lives and works in Korea. They are connected by an interactive computer network that allows two electronic keyboards to be played by Kim and Kelly as if they were side-by-side. Kim's voice and image are available to Kelly, and vice versa.

Joe and Marie are two of over a hundred students attending Dr. Johannsen's course on quantum mechanics at the Maricopa Community Colleges. The "class" is distributed to over a dozen universities and two-year colleges in the U.S., Germany, Great Britain, and Russia. Students correspond regularly and instantly via electronic mail, which includes images, data, voice, and full-motion video; their computers automatically translate the different languages. The students are currently conducting an experiment. But where is the experiment taking place? On which campus? In which country? The answer: all places at once. The experiment is a student-controlled computer simulation on the network.

Colleges of the future will be able to reach students in isolated places with courseware individually designed so students can learn at their own pace, in their own way.

From Vision to Reality: An Agenda for Action

This vision of the campus of the future is closer than most might expect. However, to make this vision a reality will take leadership and cooperative action by all those involved in meeting the challenge.

First, the computer and telecommunications industries, governments, and international agencies, as well as college professors and administrators, must work together to recommend and develop standards that enable users to talk to one another easily and instantaneously across the nation or around the world.

Second, the computer industry must provide educators with solutions that make it easy and attractive to use computers in creative ways. At IBM, this means working to develop tools that enable faculty to create instructional materials and classroom presentations easily; it also means developing networking products with which teachers can manage, customize, and administer lessons on classroom computers connected in local area networks that respond to real needs and requirements.

Third, working together as partners, the computer industry and education must find ways to make educational software more available and less costly. One way is to make it more rewarding for members of the academic community to spend time developing courseware for their classes. Another way is to take advantage of the special expertise and resources of each party in joint development projects. Still another is to develop a broad base of users so that the cost of developing solutions is spread among many rather than a few.

And last—but most important—the computer industry and education must learn more about each other. Companies like IBM must make an even greater effort to understand the education environment and, in particular, the challenges and distinct requirements of community colleges, a vital segment of the educational system that serves as a link to all others.

Looking Ahead

IBM recognizes the critical role community colleges play in guaranteeing access to higher education for all people in society, in training and retraining a work force to compete in a global economy, and in providing essential skills to underprepared students and adults to help them become productive citizens. This year, IBM created the Multimedia and Education Division, which encompasses all IBM's marketing and development activities in K-12, higher education, and lifetime learning. Needless to say, community colleges will be a major focus of this division.

The establishment of this division is intended to send a strong signal that education is a top priority in all that IBM does as a company. It is also a recognition that multimedia technology will forever change the ways people teach and learn and live and work. And it is a commitment to develop and market multimedia application solutions that best serve the goals that IBM and community colleges have in common—improved education opportunities for the people of the world.

H. G. Wells once wrote, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." Computer technology provides the edge needed to win that race. It provides the opportunity to extend the capabilities of individuals, to reach new levels of excellence, and to make education an integral part of our lives—all our lives long.

Lucie J. Fjeldstad is corporate vice president and president of IBM's newly created Multimedia and Education Division. This abstract excerpts key points of her major, multimedia presentation of the same title made at the League for Innovation's annual conference on computing, October 23, 1990, in Dallas, Texas. A copy of the full text of her remarks is available from Cynthia DiTallo, (914) 642-5577.

Volume 3, number 19
December 1990

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

"WHEN THE PUPIL IS READY, THE TEACHER APPEARS."

Joseph N. Hankin

Maxims are different from one-liners in that they generally do not reach for humor nor depend upon contemporary contexts for meaning. Yet, the best of them convey wisdom drawn from experience that comes as close to universal truth as most of us ever approach. The following is a sampling of insights from the experience of one generation of community college leaders. Hopefully, they constitute a small piece of a legacy to be passed on to the generation now being groomed to lead community colleges into the next century.

Maxims for Public Consumption

Community college presidents learn to take seriously the importance of communicating effectively with their various publics. Several maxims apply to this task.

Perception is more important than reality. Community college leaders must attend carefully to how their institutions are perceived by their various constituents and must not discount the significance of erroneous perceptions. College leaders need to explain forcefully the roles and purposes of their institutions, their effectiveness in fulfilling their missions, their cost-efficiency, and their value to their students and communities.

Two is different from, not less than, four. Unfortunately, two is arithmetically less than four, so two-year colleges are perceived to be of less value than their four-year counterparts. Community college leaders need to acknowledge this handicap and make the case that their institutions are different from, not less than, four-year colleges and universities. They need to demonstrate that community colleges are sophisticated and complex institutions in their own right, not merely junior versions of their senior counterparts. They must find it inconceivable to want to become four-year colleges.

Hospitals admitting well patients have high cure rates. Perhaps the strongest argument that community colleges have for public support is that they add more value in student knowledge and skills for less investment of resources than any other type of educational institution. It is unfortunate that the argument is made at the expense of prestigious four-year colleges and universities who admit only students with high skills.

The excellence of a circle lies in its roundness, not in its bigness. This maxim applies not only to communicating with constituents but also to determining relevant ways to measure success. The question should never be How large is the institution? nor How much has it grown? The question needs to be How well is the college accomplishing what it set out to do?

Maxims to Maintain Motivating Visions

Maxims can help articulate the reasons that community colleges exist, as well as keep leaders focused on historic and appropriate goals.

Philosophy cannot follow finance. This maxim is cautionary, suggesting that institutions cannot succeed indefinitely by changing directions depending on which way the financial winds are blowing. They must chart a course to accomplish their priorities, and then find a way to finance their journeys—and not vice versa.

We shape our buildings, and then they shape us. Winston Churchill is said to have made this remark, which provides another caution that program priorities and visions of the future of community colleges should not be limited by the physical plant constructed mostly during the 1960s and 1970s. Flexible spaces, both on and off campus, will be required to support the kinds of programs that will be needed in the next century.

Access and quality are not mutually exclusive. The motivating vision for the most democratic educational institutions ever established cannot be compromised. Access to all who can benefit must remain a core community college value. Those who would limit access to increase quality show too little faith in the resourcefulness of community colleges to implement high-quality programs to meet the diverse needs of all of their students. Access is meaningless without quality, and a vision for community colleges easily encompasses both.

Maxims for 21st Century Managers and Leaders

What worked in managing and leading institutions in the sixties and seventies no longer applies. Community college leaders need to adapt their styles to be successful in the participatory, information-sharing context which is the reality for all modern organizations.

What's sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander. Perhaps the first rule for would-be leaders is to understand that all college employees are important to the success of the institution. Perks that distinguish one group from another diminish the "we're all in this together" institutional climate that is understood to be key to successful organizations. If a staff evaluation plan is to be implemented, the college president should willingly be the first to be evaluated.

The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Not only are organizations enhanced by the collective actions of its members, but community colleges achieve impact beyond their walls by working together with other

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

educational institutions, community agencies, and local businesses. Terms such as "synergy" and "syncretism" have been coined to describe this enhanced impact.

It takes longer to mend fences than it does to touch bases. In the collegial atmosphere of shared governance, decisions take longer to make than in the more autocratic early days of community colleges. However tempting, skipping the step of touching bases with those affected by a decision usually results in being bogged down even longer in mending fences.

The race goes to the persistent. Not only is impatience with process a weakness to be overcome, but persistence—not taking "no" as an answer when the cause is right—is the most powerful institutional force. Similarly, taking pride in partial successes rather than decrying them as failures provides the encouragement needed to continue to press for long-term goals.

Ready, Fire, Aim. Planning is serious work that is important to the success of a college. Good planning involves all appropriate constituents in rational decision-making processes that anticipate likely future conditions. However, there are times when leaders need to trust their intuitions and act without having planned for every contingency. The trick is to determine when planning or acting is the appropriate response.

Finally, there are maxims that sum up the more personal side of the job of community college president.

Nobody wants to know the storms you have been through; they just want to know that you brought in the ship. Much has been written about how lonely it is at the top; community college presidents have no real peers at their own institutions. Networks of peers at the state and national level are important to maintain a healthy perspective on the position, as is a rewarding personal life that is neglected only at great risk. Still, participatory decision-making has not diminished ultimate responsibility for institutional success or failure.

When the pupil is ready, the teacher appears. This final maxim speaks not only to our students but to all of us as lifelong learners. We are all in the process of becoming leaders, and the kind of leaders we become is related not only to our own experiences but also to those we share with our colleagues and peers. Many of us face similar situations, yet we often operate in isolation from one another, struggling alone in the vineyards. We need to come together to share and help each of us become the best possible leader—to be boards of directors for one another's problems. Then, we need to share what we have learned and what we have become with others who would follow in our footsteps.

Joseph N. Hankin is president of Westchester Community College in Valhalla, New York. In 1965, as the author drove the 200 miles to his first community college position, he thought he saw an omen on a church bulletin board which read "Even Sinners Welcome Here." He assumed his first presidency later that year at age 26, and nothing that has transpired in the ensuing quarter of a century has changed his mind.

Volume 3, number 20
December 1990

Index of 1990 Leadership Abstracts

v3n1: *Beyond Affirmative Action: Leadership Diversity That Works*, J. Richard Gilliland

v3n2: *Staffing for a New Century: An Opportunity for Institutional Renewal*, Mardee Jenrette

v3n3: *Building Communities: A Checklist for Evaluation and Discussion*, Nancy Armes and Kay McClenney

v3n4: *Renewing a Mature Community College*, James L. Hudgins

v3n5: *Leadership for Teaching and Learning*, K. Patricia Cross

v3n6: *Statewide Articulation Cannot Be Done Tongue in Cheek*, Arthur R. Southerland, Rex Leonard, George D. Edwards, and James R. Hutto

v3n7: *Partnerships with K-12 School Districts*, Allen D. Arnold

v3n8: *Strategies for Serving Underprepared Students*, Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

v3n9: *The Tech Prep Program: A New Course of Study*, Joe Grimsley

v3n10: *Insuring Excellence in Community College Teaching*, John E. Roueche

v3n11: *Responding to International Student Needs: A Model That Is Working*, Jean Conway, Patsy Fulton, and Mike Khirallah

v3n12: *The President's Role in Student Tracking*, Jim Palmer

v3n13: *Not Leaving Technology Decisions to the "Techies" and "Gurus,"* Carol Cross

v3n14: *Strengthening the Transfer Function: From a "Zero-Sum" Game to a "Win-Win" Situation*, Judith S. Eaton

v3n15: *Leading a College Economic Development Program*, Stephen G. Katsinas and Vincent A. Lacey

v3n16: *American Higher Education on the Grill*, Dan Angel

v3n17: *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages*, Tom Gonzales

v3n18: *Implementing a Diversity Restructuring Program*, Laura I. Rendon

v3n19: *Time to Teach a New World: Technology and Education in the 21st Century*, Lucie J. Fjeldstad

v3n20: *"When the Pupil Is Ready, The Teacher Appears."* Joseph N. Hankin

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
JUN 28 1991

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.